BLM LIBRARY
88081958

PROCEEDINGS

NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD COUNCIL

TWENTY - SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING

March 28 - 30, 1966

Riverside, California

RECEIVED
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RIVERSIDE, CALIF.
JUN 3 - 1966

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
STEWART L. UDALL, *Secretary*

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Charles H. Stoddard, *Director*

HD
241
.A25
1966

#57511810 ID:88081958
CALIFORNIA STATE OFFICE
CENTRAL LIBRARY COPY
HD
241
.A25
1966

CONTENTS

	Page
General Statement	1
Attendance	2
Proceedings, Opening Session, March 28	7
Proceedings, Afternoon Session, March 28	10
Proceedings, All Day Tour Session, March 29	12
Social Hour and Dinner, Evening, March 29	12
Proceedings, Morning Session, March 30	12
Proceedings, Afternoon Session, March 30	13
Proceedings, Executive Session, March 30	13
Certification of Cochairman	14

Statement of Senator Henry M. Jackson, Washington	Appendix No. 1
Statement of Senator Ernest Gruening, Alaska	Appendix No. 2
Statement of Senator Wayne L. Morse, Oregon	Appendix No. 3
Statement of Senator George McGovern, South Dakota	Appendix No. 4
Statement of Wallace F. Bennett, Utah	Appendix No. 5
Statement of Senator Milward L. Simpson, Wyoming	Appendix No. 6
Statement of Representative Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado	Appendix No. 7
Special Letter, Representative Ken W. Dyal, California	Appendix No. 8

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

Special Letter, Representative John V. Tunney, California - Appendix No. 9

Statement of Harry R. Anderson, Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management, Department of the Interior - - - - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 10

Report of Charles H. Stoddard, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior - Appendix No. 11

Discussion of Hall S. McClain, Manager, Riverside District and Land Office, Bureau of Land Management - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 12

Presentation of Neil B. Pfulb, Planning Director, San Bernardino County, California - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 13

Presentation of Glen Fulcher, Chief, Range Staff, Bureau of Land Management - - - - - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 14

Opening Statement of the Honorable Fred S. Farr, California State Senate - - - - - - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 15

Initial Statement of Harold R. Hochmuth, Director, Properties Management & Development Douglas Aircraft Company, Inc. - - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 16

Initial Statement of Michael J. McCloskey, Assistant to the President, Sierra Club, California - Appendix No. 17

Initial Statement of Ian Campbell, State Geologist, Department of Conservation, State of California- Appendix No. 18

Initial Statement of Ben Glading, Chief, Game Management Branch, Department of Fish & Game, State of California - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 19

Initial Statement of Robert Reierson, Project Leader, Western Livestock Marketing Information Project, Denver, Colorado - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 20

Initial Statement of Larry Freeman, Past President, California Newspaper Publishers Association - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 21

Initial Statement of Samuel E. Wood, Executive Director, California Tomorrow - - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 22

Discussion Among Panelists and Between Panelists and Council Members - - - - - - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 23

Report from the Public Land Law Review Commission Mrs. Nancy Smith, San Bernardino County Supervisor and Commission Member - - - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 24

Committee Membership Roster - - - - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 25

Comments of Roscoe E. Bell, President, Western States Land Commissioners Association - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 26

Remarks of Rolla E. Chandler, Chief, Land Adjustment Staff, Bureau of Land Management - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 27

Remarks of Maurice Arnold, Chairman, Board of Commissioners, Valley County, Montana - Appendix No. 28

Remarks of Robert McColly, Chairman, Valley County Advisory Committee, Montana - - - Appendix No. 29

Discussion on Land Use Planning in Valley County- Appendix No. 30

Advisory Actions of the National Advisory Board Council - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Appendix No. 31

PROCEEDINGS
of the
NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD COUNCIL
Twenty-sixth Annual Meeting
Riverside, California
March 28-30, 1966

The twenty-sixth annual meeting of the National Advisory Board Council was held at the Mission Inn in Riverside, California, on March 28-30, 1966. All sessions except the executive session were open to the public.

Following posting of the colors, the Council was welcomed by the Hon. Ben H. Lewis, Mayor of Riverside. Harry R. Anderson, Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management, conveyed greetings from the Secretary of the Interior, then addressed the Council briefly on the future of public land management. Charles H. Stoddard, Director, Bureau of Land Management, reported in detail on the problems and progress of the Bureau. Glen Fulcher, Chief, Range Staff, presented and discussed in detail the Bureau's proposal for study to arrive at a sound, equitable grazing fee. Hall S. McClain, District Manager, Riverside, and Neil B. Pfulb, Planning Director, San Bernardino County, discussed public land management in the Riverside District, with particular emphasis of the county general plan in a prototype county.

The afternoon of the first day was devoted entirely to a panel presentation and discussion of the demands which a rapidly expanding population place on the unexpandable land resource, moderated by the Hon. Fred S. Farr, California State Senate.

On the second day, the Council, Bureau staff, and invited guests toured a part of the Riverside District, viewing public land management areas, problems, and accomplishments.

On the morning of the third day, the Council's five standing committee considered topics of current interest, following which committee reports were presented to the Council.

The afternoon of the third day opened with a discussion of cooperative planning in Valley County, Montana, presented by Maurice Arnold, Commissioner, Valley County; Robert McColly, Chairman, Valley County Advisory Committee; and Gene J. Etchart and Arnold Bolle, Council members from Montana. Next, Roscoe E. Bell, President, Western States Land Commissioners Association, commented on the meeting generally and the tour particularly. Then the Council met in executive session; upon the conclusion thereof, the Council adjourned.

The meeting was attended by the following:

National Advisory Board Council Members - 1966

Bruce Anderson, Texas, oil and gas
Arnold Bolle, Montana, forestry
Bruce Bowler, Idaho, outdoor recreation
Alva D. Brownfield, New Mexico, cattle
Erwin Christiansen, Montana, sheep
Theodore Conn, Oregon, wildlife
Gene J. Etchart, Montana, cattle (Chairman 1966-67)
Kumen S. Gardner, Utah, cattle
Henry C. Gerber, Oregon, cattle
Arthur J. Harris, Alaska, statewide
Homer Harrison, California, wildlife
John W. Hay, Jr., Wyoming, sheep
Vard H. Heaton, Arizona, sheep
Leonard Horn, Colorado, cattle
Dan H. Hughes, Colorado, sheep (Chairman 1965-66)
Max T. Layton, Arizona, wildlife
Francis A. LeSourd, Washington, statewide
Ray Lincoln, Idaho, sheep
J. Leonard Neal, Arizona, cattle
William G. Parsons, Nevada, alternate wildlife
Rolland K. Patrick, Idaho, cattle
Othel L. Pay, Utah, wildlife
Clarence H. Quinlan, New Mexico, sheep
Lloyd Rea, Oregon, county government
George Ricca, Arizona, county government
Gerhard N. Rostvold, California, urban-suburban development
Eldon P. Smith, Montana, wildlife
Lester R. Stewart, California, cattle
Doyal Stiles, Idaho, wildlife
Briant H. Stringham, Utah, sheep
George N. Swallow, Nevada, sheep
Robert V. Thompson, Wyoming, cattle
H. Lee Trejo, Wyoming, wildlife
Mark Wagner, Colorado, wildlife
James S. Weber, Oregon, sheep
James A. Whaley, Wyoming, soil conservation
William A. Williams, Jr., New Mexico, soil conservation
John E. Wood, New Mexico, wildlife
Roy Young, Nevada, cattle

Department of the Interior

Harry R. Anderson, Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management
Thomas J. Cavanaugh, Associate Solicitor for Public Lands

Bureau of Land Management

Charles H. Stoddard, Director (Co-chairman)
John O. Crow, Associate Director
Robert E. Wolf, Assistant to Director
Eugene V. Zumwalt, Assistant Director, Resource Management
Dan Saults, Information Officer
Jerry A. O'Callaghan, Chief, Office of Legislation and Cooperative Relations
Irving Senzel, Chief, Division of Lands and Minerals Standards and Technology
Rolla E. Chandler, Chief, Land Adjustment Staff
Glen Fulcher, Chief, Range Staff
John R. Churchill, Staff Specialist
Harold K. Johnson, Staff Specialist
J. Russell Penny, State Director, California
Fred J. Weiler, State Director, Arizona
Nolan F. Keil, State Director, Nevada
W. J. Anderson, State Director, New Mexico
Robert D. Nielson, State Director, Utah
E. J. Petersen, Assistant State Director, California
Ralph Herbert, RUS, California State Office
Robert J. Springer, District Manager, Bakersfield, California
Richard J. Thompson, District Manager, Redding, California
Hall F. McClain, District Manager, Riverside, California
Lester C. Dunn, District Manager, Sacramento, California
Rex J. Morgan, District Manager, Susanville, California
John F. Lang, District Manager, Ukiah, California
Dennis Hess, District Manager, Las Vegas, Nevada
Daniel P. Baker, Land Office Manager, Reno, Nevada
William E. Grant, Manager, OCS Office, Los Angeles, California

and others of the BLM staff

Invited guest participants:

Ben H. Lewis, Mayor of Riverside, California
Fred S. Farr, member, California State Senate
Harold R. Hochmuth, Director, Properties Management and Development, Douglas Aircraft Co.
Ian Campbell, State Geologist, California Department of Conservation
Robert Reierson, Project Leader, Western Livestock Marketing Information Project
Ben Glading, California Department of Fish and Game
Michael J. McCloskey, Assistant to the President, Sierra Club
Samuel Wood, Executive Director, California Tomorrow
Larry Freeman, Past President, California Association of Newspaper Publishers
Mrs. Nancy Smith, Supervisor, San Bernardino County
Roscoe E. Bell, President, Western States Land Commissioners Association
Maurice Arnold, Commissioner, Valley County, Montana
Robert McColly, Chairman, Valley County Advisory Committee, Montana

Representing agencies, associations, and interest groups

Foster Buckner, Regional Solicitor, Department of the Interior
Dell O. Clark, California Department of Agriculture
W. R. Christensen, Bureau of Reclamation
Paul Cox, California Division of Forestry
Mayhew H. Davis, National Forest Recreation Association
John D. Dean, Soil Conservation Service
John D. Findlay, Bureau of Sport Fish and Wildlife
Ford B. Ford, Fact Finding Committee, California State Senate
James E. Fuller, Bureau of Reclamation
Frank Furino, ABC Radio
Paul W. Hand, Bureau of Indian Affairs
E. P. Harvey, American National Cattlemen's Association
William C. Helming, American National Cattlemen's Association
Frank Hemingway, ABC Radio
Randall Henderson, Desert Protective Council
Alfred H. Kramm, California Federation of Minerological Societies
Knox Marshall, Western Wood Products Association

Representing agencies, associations, and interest groups (continued)

William B. Morse, Wildlife Management Institute
James L. Murphy, Forest Service
O. S. Peterson, National Forest Recreation Association
Douglas Reeder, California Association of 4-Wheel Drive Clubs
Kenneth C. Smith, State of California
Leo C. Smith, California Department of Water Resources
William R. Supernaugh, National Park Service
Craig J. Swenson, California Division of Highways
Robert W. Talbott, New Mexico Cattle Growers Association
Don Thomas, Douglas Aircraft Company
George H. Wheatley, Regional Solicitor, Department of the Interior

Messages of Greeting received from Members of Congress

Senator George Murphy, California
Senator Gordon Allott, Colorado
Senator Frank Church, Idaho
Senator Howard W. Cannon, Nevada
Senator Joseph Montoya, New Mexico
Senator Maurine B. Neuberger, Oregon
Senator Frank E. Moss, Utah
Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Washington

Representative Ralph J. Rivers, Alaska
Representative George F. Senner, Jr., Arizona
Representative Don H. Clausen, California
Representative Jeffery Cohelan, California
Representative Ed Reinecke, California
Representative B. F. Sisk, California
Representative Compton I. White, Jr., Idaho
Representative Rogers C. B. Morton, Maryland
Representative James F. Battin, Montana
Representative Arnold Olsen, Montana
Representative Walter S. Baring, Nevada
Representative Thomas G. Morris, New Mexico
Representative E. S. Johnny Walker, New Mexico
Representative Roy A. Taylor, North Carolina
Representative John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania
Representative Laurence J. Burton, Utah
Representative Brock Adams, Washington
Representative Julia Butler Hansen, Washington
Representative Catherine May, Washington
Representative Lloyd Meeds, Washington
Representative Thomas Pelly, Washington
Representative Teno Roncalio, Wyoming

*Statements received from Members of Congress

Senator Henry M. Jackson, Washington
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs
Senator Ernest Gruening, Alaska
Senator Wayne L. Morse, Oregon
Senator George McGovern, South Dakota
Senator Wallace F. Bennett, Utah
Senator Milward L. Simpson, Wyoming

Representative Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

**Special letters received from Members of Congress

Representative Ken W. Dyal, California
Representative John V. Tunney, California

* Included as Appendix No. 1 through Appendix No. 7 to these proceedings.
** Included as Appendix No. 8 and Appendix No. 9 to these proceedings.

Proceedings, Opening Session, March 28:

The 26th Annual Meeting of the National Advisory Board Council of the Department of the Interior convened in the Spanish Art Gallery of the Mission Inn at Riverside, California. Background music was furnished by a unit of the 15th Air Force Band of March Field.

Chairman Dan H. Hughes called the meeting to order at 8:55 a.m., Monday, March 28, 1966. Immediately thereafter, the following delegation was read:

> "Pursuant to the regulations set forth in 43 CFR 4114.3-1, the Director, Bureau of Land Management, or his designee, is designated Cochairman of the National Advisory Board Council for its Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting scheduled to be held in Riverside, California, beginning March 28, 1966.
>
> /s/ Stewart L. Udall
> Secretary of the Interior"

Next, the colors were posted by a color guard unit of the 15th Air Force, following which Charles H. Stoddard, Director, Bureau of Land Management, and designated Cochairman, lead the pledge of allegiance.

Then Harry R. Anderson, Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management, Department of the Interior, introduced the Honorable Ben H. Lewis, Mayor of Riverside, who welcomed the Council with the following message:

> "Secretary Anderson, Judge Hughes, Director Stoddard, Gentlemen:
>
> 'As the Mayor of Riverside, it gives me great deal of pleasure to welcome you to Riverside and I bring the greetings of the City of Riverside to you. I hope during your stay here that you will have an opportunity to see not only the Mission Inn but, as well, the City of Riverside. If there is any thing we can do to make your stay more pleasant, I am sure that we will do so.
>
> 'It is a real pleasure for me to work with the Bureau of Land Management -- I haven't had too many opportunities to, but Mr. McClain /District Manager, Riverside/ and I have a real good work arrangement and there are many things that you can do for us.

'So it is with a great deal of pleasure that I welcome you to Riverside. Thank you."

Next, Brunel Christensen, Chairman of the California State Advisory Board, the host board, welcomed the Council with the following message:

"Mr. Secretary, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Director and Gentlemen:

'Although you are in my home State and I have the responsibility of welcoming you here, a lot of you live closer to this area than I do. I am 900 miles from home. I feel as though a few of you really don't understand California and the way we are set up. I live clear up in the northeast corner of the State and I found out last night that even the people from Utah are closer to here than I am.

'But, we would like to have you feel welcome to California, and we hope that while you are here you will get to see some of the problems that this State is experiencing in public land management.

'It is hard to realize, but this is a State that is growing on the basis of 2,000 new people a day in addition to our natural growth, and the complexities of managing public lands are being compounded each day, even as far North as I am. Far away from this area of great population, we are still feeling the pressure. They are changing our thinking here in California to using these lands orderly, coordinating the use of the public lands even with our private lands. Just a month ago, a group of us had an opportunity to meet with the Governor and talk over this very problem about the orderly use of all the lands in California to take care of this great growth of population in the West.

'I don't know that there is a great deal that I can do for you in this area because I am somewhat of a stranger, too. I am sure that I will have some free time to organize something for you, maybe some night activity, or something, but we want you to feel welcome here and anything that we can do for you while you are in California, please let us know.

'We hope you take a good look at what's happening to the public lands problem in California because I think, although

we are first, we are not going to be different from the rest of you and the rest of the States. The answers that will come out of California, I think, on public land management will be the answer to this Nation.

'We hope you enjoy yourselves here. We want to thank you, Mr. Mayor, for the opportunity to meet in Riverside and if there's anything that I can do for you, please let me know. Thank you."

Then J. Russell Penny, California State Director, Bureau of Land Management, welcomed the Council with the following message, quoted in part:

"Mr. Secretary, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Director, Gentlemen:

'It certainly gives me great pleasure to add to the welcome given by Mayor Lewis and Chairman Christensen.

'We in the Bureau in California took it upon ourselves to make this meeting today 'California's Number One Job of the Day.' ...Our people have gone all out to make your stay here as enjoyable as possible and your deliberations as fruitful as possible...."

After which, Mr. Penny recognized and introduced Bureau staff members responsible for arrangements, explain services available, and made several announcements.

Following the messages of welcome, Director Stoddard introduced new and returning members to the Council, invited guest participants, and new Bureau personnel.

Next messages and statements from Members of Congress were read.

Assistant Secretary Anderson then expressed greetings from the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, and the Secretary's regrets that he could not be present, following which Mr. Anderson addressed the Council on the major objectives in Federal land management. Mr. Anderson's statement is included as Appendix No. 10 to these proceedings.

Then Director Stoddard presented the Bureau of Land Management report, a comprehensive statement of the progress made since the last regular meeting of the Council, the major problems with which the Bureau is currently faced, and the plans for future programs and actions. Director Stoddard's report appears as Appendix No. 11 to these proceedings.

Next, Hall S. McClain, Manager, Riverside District and Land Office, discussed and explained public land management in the Riverside District. Mr. McClain's discussion is included as Appendix No. 12 to these proceedings.

After a short recess, Neil B. Pfulb, Planning Director, San Bernardino County, California, presented and discussed a county general plan in a prototype county. (San Bernardino is one of six counties cooperatively selected by the Bureau of Land Management and the National Association of Counties for the purpose of developing and testing procedures under the Classification and Multiple Use Act and the Public Land Sale Act.) Mr. Pfulb's presentation is included as Appendix No. 13 to these proceedings.

Following a fifteen minute recess, Bruce Anderson, Council member and Chairman of the Industry Use Committee, assumed the chair and called the committee into session, with all other members of the Council as temporary ex officio members of the committee, for the purpose of discussing and considering grazing fees. (The Industry Use Committee met briefly and informally on the preceding evening, Sunday, March 27.) Mr. Anderson reviewed briefly the grazing fee problem and considerations to date, after which he called on Glen Fulcher, Chief, Range Staff, Bureau of Land Management. Dr. Fulcher reviewed the background and somewhat more thoroughly, then presented a proposal by which a fair and equitable grazing fee could be arrived at through scientific study. Dr. Fulcher's presentation and the ensuing discussion are included as Appendix No. 14 to these proceedings.

Whereupon the Council recessed for lunch at 12:25 p.m.

Afternoon Session, Monday, March 28:

The Council reconvened at 1:35 p.m., whereupon Assistant Secretary Anderson introduced the Honorable Fred S. Farr, California State Senator from Monterey County, and Chairman of the State Senate Natural Resources Fact Finding Committee. Senator Farr moderated a panel presentation and discussion of the demands a rapidly expanding population place on the unexpandable land resource. After opening remarks, which are included as Appendix No. 15 to these proceedings, Senator Farr introduced, in turn the following panelists who spoke on the topics indicated:

Harold Hochmuth, Director Properties Management and Development Douglas Aircraft Company, Inc.	"Industry and the Future"

Michael J. McCloskey Assistant to the President Sierra Club	"Recreation and the Future"
Ian Campbell State Geologist Department of Conservation State of California	"Minerals and the Future"
Ben Glading, Chief Game Management Branch Department of Fish and Game State of California	"Wildlife and the Future"
Robert Reierson Project Leader Western Livestock Marketing Information Project	"Livestock and the Future"
Larry Freeman Past President California Newspaper Publishers Association	"People and the Future"
Samuel Wood Executive Director California Tomorrow	"Cities and the Future"

The initial statements of the panelists are included as Appendix No. 16 through 21, respectively, to these proceedings.

Following the initial presentations, panelists discussed among themselves and then with Council members, various relevant points which were raised. Because of the importance of the subject matter and the unusual interest which was shown, the discussion is not summarized but, rather, selected portions are included as Appendix No. 23 to these proceedings.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the Council recessed at 4:50 p.m.

Proceedings, Tour Session, Tuesday, March 29:

On Tuesday, March 29, Council members, invited guest participants, and Bureau staff toured a small part of the Riverside District in northern Riverside and southern San Bernardino Counties. The tour demonstrated the need of planning now for the future management of the public lands administered by the Bureau. The results of poor planning or lack of planning in the past, particularly with small tract areas, was evident. Growing pressures for the use and disposition of public lands were shown.

Covering more than 260 miles, the trip was informative and educational. Tour participants readily saw the need for and benefits to be gained from mutual cooperation with State agencies, counties, communities, interested groups, and knowledgeable individuals toward the development of dynamic land use planning.

Social Hour and Dinner, Tuesday, March 29:

After returning to Riverside, participants, joined by other guests, gathered for a social hour then dinner at the Mission Inn. Following dinner, Mrs. Nancy Smith, County Supervisor of San Bernardino County, and public member of the Public Land Law Review Commission, reported to the group on the recent activities of the Commission. Her report is included in its entirety as Appendix No. 24 to these proceedings.

Proceedings, Morning Session, Wednesday, March 30:

The five standing committees of the National Advisory Board Council met from 8:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday, March 30, 1966. First, each committee selected a chairman for the ensuing year. (Membership of the five committees appears as Appendix No. 25 to these proceedings.)

Next, each committee discussed and considered topics of current interest and formulated a report to the Council setting forth the committees recommendations. (Committee reports are not included as a part of these proceedings; however, committee recommendations as adopted by the Council are set forth in Appendix No. 31 hereto.)

At 11 a.m., the Council reconvened in full session, at which time each chairman presented the report of his committee for Council consideration. The Council adopted some of the recommendations at this time and deferred consideration of others until the afternoon executive session. Whereupon, the Council recessed for lunch at 12 noon.

Proceedings, Afternoon Session, Wednesday, March 30:

The Council reconvened in full session at 1 p.m., on Wednesday, March 30. First, Roscoe E. Bell, President of the Western States Land Commissioners Association, commented in detail on the field tour and other aspects of the meeting. Mr. Bell's commentary appears as Appendix No. 26 to these proceedings.

Next, Rolla E. Chandler, Chief, Land Adjustment Staff, Bureau of Land Management, discussed background and progress of Bureau programs under the Classification and Multiple Use Act. Mr. Chandler's remarks are included as Appendix No. 27 to these proceedings.

Then, Gene J. Etchart, Council member from Glasgow, Valley County, Montana, introduced the topic, "Valley County Leads the Way," a discussion of cooperative planning in Valley County, Montana, one of the prototype counties. Mr. Etchart gave some of the geographic and economic background of Valley County, then, in turn, introduced Maurice Arnold, Chairman, Board of County Commissioners, Valley County, and Robert McColly, Chairman, Valley County Advisory Committee, who told the story of county-wide land use planning in their county. The remarks of Messrs. Arnold and McColly are included as Appendix No. 28 and Appendix No. 29, respectively to these proceedings.

Then Arnold Bolle, Erwin Christensen, and Eldon Smith, Council members from Montana, commented further. Dr. Bolle explained a study being undertaken by the University of Montana toward the development of examples, based on the Valley County experience, which could be followed by other counties. Dr. Bolle commented particularly on the measurements of benefits from various uses and services. Mr. Christensen commented on the need for informative or explanatory literature based on the Valley County experience. Mr. Smith concluded the presentation with a statement of his impressions and of the needs for expanded land management.

A question and answer period then followed, the transcript of which is included as Appendix No. 30 to these proceedings, after which the Council recessed briefly.

Proceedings, Executive Session, Wednesday, March 30:

The Council reconvened in executive session at 3:40 p.m. on Wednesday, March 30.

217-692 O-66—2

As the first item of business, the Council continued the consideration of those recommendations of the standing committees which were held over from the morning session for further deliberation.

As the second item of business, the Council voted unanimously to elect Gene J. Etchart of Montana as Chairman and reelect Alva D. Brownfield of New Mexico as Vice Chairman, for the ensuing year.

Immediately preceding the selection of officers, Judge Dan H. Hughes of Colorado, longtime Chairman and a member of the Council for twenty-six years, announced that he would not be a candidate to succeed himself, mainly for physical reasons. Council members were unanimous in expressing their appreciation to Judge Hughes for his long, untiring public service in guiding and directing the Council.

The Council next heard, discussed, and considered recommendations and suggestions from individual members.

The advisory actions adopted by the Council and recommended to the Secretary of the Interior for his consideration are set forth in Appendix No. 31 to these proceedings.

The National Advisory Board Council adjourned its 26th Annual Meeting at 5:15 p.m. on Wednesday, March 30, 1966, to meet next at the call of the Secretary of the Interior.

I certify that I attended the proceedings of the National Advisory Board Council herein reported and that these minutes are an accurate summary account of the matters discussed and the conclusions reached. The detailed proceedings of this meeting, including committee reports, are of record in this office where they may be examined by interested parties.

May 9, 1966
Date

Charles H. Stoddard

Charles H. Stoddard, Director
Bureau of Land Management
Cochairman
Washington, D. C.

Appendix No. 1

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON, WASHINGTON
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 28, 1966.

While I will not be able to attend your 26th Annual Meeting in Riverside, please accept my greetings and very best wishes for an outstandingly successful session.

As a member of the Public Land Law Review Commission, as well as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I am well aware of the importance of the National Advisory Board Council.

The extensive program which the Council has prepared indicates the broad spectrum of today's public land problems, as well as the Council's alertness to the necessity of their solution. My congratulations on designing a very fine agenda.

Appendix No. 2

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, ALASKA
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 28, 1966.

As a Senator from the State in which more land is in the public domain and administered by the Bureau of Land Management than any other, I wish to express my particular interest in the deliberations of the National Advisory Board Council during its 26th annual meeting. I regret that the press of legislative responsibilities prevents my attendance at your meeting.

Alaska looks forward to welcoming you at your 1967 meeting which will be held during the Alaska celebration of the centennial of its purchase. When you meet in Alaska you will have a firsthand opportunity to observe the extremely important responsibility for land management which is held by the Department of the Interior. Since nearly all of Alaska is managed by the Department of the Interior, the State presents a unique example of the essential importance of administration of land resources to meet effectively the needs of people.

Meanwhile, I am interested to see that one of your topics of discussion is that of the expanding population of the United States. This is a subject in which I have long been particularly interested and on which I have held a series of hearings as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Senate Government Operations Committee, on my bill, S. 1676. The fact of a rapidly increasing population in the United States requires all who manage its resources to take particular account of this phenomenon. I will be very much interested in any recommendations that may come from your discussion of the relationship of the population explosion to land utilization.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WAYNE L. MORSE, OREGON
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 28, 1966.

While my schedule of legislative work in the Senate makes it impossible for me to join the National Advisory Board Council for public lands in its deliberations at Riverside, California, I want you to know of my interest in your efforts.

You are meeting at a historic moment in the course of public land management. The Classification and Multiple Use Act was enacted in 1964. Your national advisory group and State and local advisory boards have played key roles in assisting the Bureau of Land Management in developing the procedures under which this act will be administered. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to commend Director Stoddard for his real interest in having widespread public participation in the writing and review of the regulations.

The relationships that are being built by the Bureau of Land Management with county governments, Soil Conservation Districts, and State agencies will make it possible to provide for the maximum use and yields of our public lands under the multiple use charter provided by the Congress in the 1964 act.

Thorough discussion of the initial classification actions is of tremendous importance, so I am sure that Director Stoddard will make use of State, national and district advisory boards to the fullest in the administration of this act.

Decisions relating to public business should be handled through procedures which assure public disclosure and the implications of the administrative decisions. There can be no substitute for public hearings when doubts are to be resolved.

Your charge is an important one. Not only is it for you to advise the Secretary and the Director of BLM on various policy and program matters, but it is equally your responsibility to make the consultative machinery of the advisory boards a viable institution in making sure that all segments of the public understand these administrative programs and decisions.

All interests, whether in mineral exploration, livestock grazing, timber operations, conservation, recreation and those who seek to protect watersheds and downstream values, will gain increased returns and use of public lands when these lands have been properly classified for retention or disposal.

Then we will have sound arguments to request of the American people and the Congress adequate investments in our land resources.

We will look to the Land Law Review Commission to bring our land laws into focus to meet the challenge of our 800 billion dollar economy and our 190 million American citizens. Working together, I know the job can be done, and done well.

My every good wish for a most successful conference, is extended to all attending the meeting of the National Advisory Board Council.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN, SOUTH DAKOTA
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 28, 1966.

It is a special pleasure to extend greetings to all of those attending the 26th annual meeting of the National Advisory Board Council for Public Lands.

The pressures of a rapidly expanding population require the wisest possible planning and protection of our public land resources. All of us are indebted to the members of the Council for your dedication and service in this vital effort.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WALLACE F. BENNETT, UTAH
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 28, 1966.

Please convey my greetings and best wishes to all attending the National Advisory Board Council annual meeting in Riverside. I regret that pressing Senate duties force me to remain in Washington and miss what I know will be an interesting affair.

I have always taken a keen interest in public lands problems--three-fourths of my State is public land--and I am sure that the meeting will serve as an excellent sounding board as well as convey much needed information on the subject.

Best personal regards.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MILWARD L. SIMPSON, WYOMING
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 28, 1966.

The National Advisory Board Council for Public Lands has an outstanding record of accomplishment and service during its quarter century of existence. From the looks of the agenda of the meeting, this tradition will be maintained.

As a member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I deeply regret that I cannot be in California for this meeting, but I look forward to reading of your discussions and conclusions.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE WAYNE N. ASPINALL, COLORADO
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 28, 1966.

I wish to convey my best wishes to the members of the National Advisory Board Council for a successful meeting on the occasion of your 26th Annual Conference. It is with sincere regret that I am unable to be with you today and to participate in your discussion.

We have much in common. As Chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Public Land Law Review Commission I have a deep and continuing interest in your deliberations and the recommendations which the Council may submit as a result of this meeting. You have chosen an ideal location for your meeting. The Cities of Riverside and San Bernardino are typical examples of rapidly expanding population centers that place new and increasing demands upon the public lands. How well these new demands are met and integrated with existing uses will reflect, to a large measure, the success of public land legislation passed in the 88th Congress and will certainly receive our careful consideration in formulating recommendations for new legislation.

It is to groups such as yours that we in Congress look for guidance and recommendation. I wish you every success.

LETTER FROM REPRESENTATIVE KENNETH W. DYAL
Member of Congress, Thirty-third District, California
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 28.

Dear Mr. Anderson:

I am tremendously pleased the National Advisory Board Council for public lands is holding its 26th Annual Meeting in the San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario Metropolitan Area. I am informed this is the first meeting in the State of California.

Our first Anglo-Saxon pioneers arrived in the Valley where you will be meeting in the year 1851. They had been preceded, of course, by that great explorer, de Anza and by those courageous padres, Fathers Garces and Dumetz. At the time when the Mormon pioneers entered Southern California there were only 5,523 persons in all of the state -- now the number is rapidly approaching the 20 million mark. Our exploding population problems in California accompanied by our concern over the proper utilization of land and adequate supplies of water make your meeting most significant.

I recently complimented Mr. Charles H. Stoddard, Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior for his recognition of the desert areas as a new frontier in recreation and I am pleased he recognized that desert lands are fragile and great care should be given as to the best kind of improvements that will best serve recreational needs and that steps should be taken to preserve historic landmarks and the flora and fauna of the desert.

I am also pleased to note that the Honorable Fred S. Farr, Member of our California State Senate, will be moderator dealing in this very subject and also that Mrs. Nancy Smith, a Member of the Board of Supervisors of San Bernardino County and a Member of the Public Land Law Review Commission, will be one of your principle speakers.

My best wishes for a successful conference.

217-692 O-66—3

LETTER FROM REPRESENTATIVE JOHN V. TUNNEY
Member of Congress, Thirty-eighth District, California
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 28.

Dear Mr. Anderson:

Thank you very much for your recent letter concerning the 26th Annual Meeting of the National Advisory Board Council for public lands in Riverside, California on March 28 to the 30th.

Unfortunately, previous commitments in my District and here in Washington prevent my attending the meetings; however, I have delegated my District Representative, Mr. Clare Taber, to attend the meetings in my absence.

I am forwarding the copy of the agenda and your letter to Mr. Taber for his information.

Again, thank you for the invitation and for the additional information on the meetings.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES IN FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT

Statement of Harry R. Anderson, Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management, Department of the Interior, to the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 28, 1966.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Advisory Board, Mr. Mayor, Gentlemen:

I appreciate this opportunity to speak to you briefly about our major objectives in Federal land management. Secretary Udall asked me to express his regrets that he could not be here. He sends his greetings and best wishes for a productive meeting.

Director Stoddard will report to you shortly on activities of the Bureau of Land Management. You will hear from him and others on the plans for the immediate future. I would like to discuss some of our long range goals as I see them today.

On forage: In the area of forage, it is recognized that BLM lands play an important role in maintaining the western livestock industry. The contribution of these lands to the total national production of forage is comparatively small -- only about four percent -- but, nonetheless, very vital in the Western States.

We believe the comparative importance of BLM forage will increase as the demand for meat increases in coming years. While there is much idle private acreage today, nationally, we cannot assume that the need for increased forage in the future will be met entirely by the private sector.

The developing trend of increased exports of food may wipe out today's surplus acreage by the end of this century, or before. If this trend continues, there will be a greater demand on BLM lands for forage.

We will continue our efforts to improve both the quality and the quantity of range lands. Much of the work to improve watersheds will contribute to the need for additional forage. On the other hand, it may be necessary to reduce the grazing load temporarily, in some areas, so that damaged land may recover. The outlook, though, is for a net increase in forage capacity.

A great deal of late oil is being burned on the matter of grazing fees. I believe it is necessary for us to demonstrate the value of our forage -- and to do so clearly and convincingly. We should identify the varying degrees of quality in specific locations and bring about a closer conformity between the fees charged and the actual use.

Something on timber: Timber production from BLM lands is rather small when compared to national consumption. But here, again, the BLM contribution is of tremendous importance in a particular area, the Pacific Northwest. We believe the relative importance of BLM timber will increase, not only because of the rapid harvest of private timber, but also because of the growing demand for timber products. In 1965, for example, log exports topped 900 million board feet, three times the amount of 1962.

The time is near, I believe, when we will have to begin treating our forests as forest farms. We are approaching the time -- perhaps it is already here -- when we will have to give considerably more attention to thinning, stand improvement, and other more intensive management techniques to assure the adequate future supply of timber.

It has been suggested to me that perhaps we need a "tree for tree" philosophy, a tree produced for every one cut, in areas where this would contribute to the local economy and our national needs. It may be that we should reforest nonproductive lands at an even greater rate.

Some will scoff, as they did long ago in Europe, and say we cannot run out of trees: There are too many. To reverse an old saying, "There are some who can't see the trees for the forest." The trees are individual, and the supply is limited. Those who think otherwise can ask any European about the exhaustability of forests.

More oil is burning late as we seek enlightenment on the best ways to manage and market the timber resources. The best ways may be a little different from what we are doing now. If they are, there will be differences of opinion about whether they are best, just as there are differences of opinion today. Your best judgment will be essential to the resolution of these problems.

Something on watersheds: Every asset of the land is endangered when the watershed is declining. There are losses in forage, timber, water production, wildlife and recreation. In addition to these losses, the reduction of watershed creates its own detrimental by-product: sedimentation, floods, salinization and other forms of pollution. Further, we know that soil, once lost, is irreplaceable in our time.

We have technology which makes it both practical and feasible to halt accelerated erosion. We have compelling reasons to save our soil and water. In the latter case, it is expected that our water needs in the year 2000 -- only 34 years from now -- will considerably exceed supplies under present methods of management, or lack of management and use. To arrest deterioration of our watersheds, where accelerated erosion is silting streams and reservoirs, BLM is embarking upon an active program of conservation practices called the "frail lands program."

We cannot afford losses in forage, timber, water production, wildlife, and recreation. We must have gains.

Something on wildlife: The new conservation movement includes a sharp increase in public interest in wildlife. Part of this interest undoubtedly is spurred by efforts to save our endangered species. We should look more closely at our capabilities to bolster the wildlife resources. There is much we can do in cooperation with the States and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

We realize that the problem of access is an obstacle to achieving best results and we must try to solve this problem. Another important factor is the improvement of wildlife habitat with the adequate management of the livestock range to restore vegetative conditions.

We should try to create this improved wildlife habitat. There is perhaps nothing else that we could do that would bring greater rewards in human enjoyment.

The field of recreation: Affluence makes for itchy feet. When Americans get this kind of itch, they like to scratch by going outdoors, by getting away from the urban scene. We have a great deal of the "room to roam" they are looking for. And, they are finding BLM lands in great numbers. Only limited basic facilities are diverting some of the tide. We must give more attention to recreation and the facilities that are needed. Not only is there growing affluence, there is a growing complexity in our daily life. And this, in itself, demands respite from the paved environment.

Urban expansion: We recognize that the growth of cities will create demands on the public domain. Where these problems exist, as they do in San Bernardino County, we will make every effort to accommodate local governing bodies. We do not, however, foresee that this will create a substantial demand for public lands, when viewed in the total.

This use, and others, will involve public participation in public land planning and classification. This public involvement is welcomed, because it will make our work more responsive to public needs.

And this, gentlemen, is why we are in business.

Appendix No. 11

REPORT FROM BLM

Report of Charles H. Stoddard, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, to the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 28, 1966.

I want to take the opportunity -- time is running short on us because of the amount of work and the time available -- to present a brief report on the progress that we are making on several programs in the Bureau of Land Management with the public lands and present some of the specifics and toss out some problems for your consideration in the next several days.

We are anxious to have the Council do a thorough review of the work that we have under way, and to help keep us guided in the right direction, because the future land pattern responsibility is now being made by the decisions that are made everyday. The Public Land Law Review Commission will very carefully watch the work we are doing here and look for the guidance that we can give them when they set the final course.

I noticed in a magazine called "News Front," which, I think, is a relatively new magazine, and it digests a good deal of news, an item called "Urban Explosion."

"Within 35 years the United States has built as many urban homes, highways and facilities as it has built since the Pilgrims landed. Since 1945, the United States has added to its population as many people, 54 million, as now live in the United Kingdom. All of this growth has been in the suburbs. Central city and rural populations have been declining. By the end of this century both urban population and city land will double and we will have to rebuild the entire urban area of the United States."

It goes on, and ends up saying, "The dominant issues of U. S. politics in the future are likely to be those of metropolitan areas in the role of Federal, State and local government."

Senator Gruening, in his letter, indicated that he had been having some hearings on population, birth control and so on. But, what we are talking about right now, really, are the people who are already on earth and are in the United States -- where they are moving, where the pressure is being developed, where their residences and industrial developments are.

We have been working for a number of months now toward implementing the Classification and Multiple Use Act and the Public Sale Act which Congress enacted on a temporary basis.

There are a number of other items that I want to talk about. As you know, there has been a push on the review of user fees of all kinds by the administration -- we will get into the subject later on this morning, and will discuss the issues in considerable detail.

I won't go into this now except to say: We are working on the general objective of what is called "fair market value." This assumes -- the Congress assumes the fair market value is informed buyers, sellers who are under no pressure to determine, that the free market will determine that this is a fair price. But, this is the economic theory. We are confronted with economic reality, and we are going to go through a good many deliberations on this, working closely with the users in arriving at the final results.

We have also, in the different fields, the same situation as we do in grazing fees. In timber, we are reconsidering our timber appraisal system. We are reviewing the method by which we arrive at the value of the timber that we put up for sale against competitive bidding. We are also reviewing the present method of oral sales as against sealed bidding as an alternative to determine how nearly we come to competitive price under the two methods. Both of these are in the process of study and consideration and we will be reporting to you on this from time to time.

We are also reconsidering the allowable cut, the calculations that we use to determine the allowable cut, both public domain and privately owned seed timber, plus new techniques in forest management. As Harry Anderson pointed out, we have to look more intensely toward forestry than we have in the past to see if the volume of timber that we have will take care of the population we expect to have.

So, these are two major matters at issue, the grazing fees and the timber appraisals, together with the user fee consideration.

We have had quite a few internal changes in the Bureau, organizational changes which I think you are generally familiar with. The situation which existed over a year ago was that we had a number of proposals in response to the administration's efforts toward -- or directives toward -- economy and efficiency under which we looked at the various

administrative field units that the Bureau maintained -- the advisory boards, the district offices, the State Offices, and the Washington Office -- to determine how we could bring about consolidations and improvements for better utilization of manpower.

We proposed several consolidations of district offices and consolidations of advisory boards where two advisory boards were dealing with one district office. We completed all the actions.

Now, just briefly on these proposals. Because of competition of some local boards and interested citizens, we cancelled action on some of the proposals and we carried the remainder through to completion. Those accomplished were as follows:

District office mergers: Brigham City-Murray Districts were consolidated in Salt Lake City with the retention of a suboffice, now called "Resource Area Headquarters" in Brigham City.

In New Mexico, Farmington and Albuquerque Districts were consolidated at Albuquerque with the retention of a field office at Farmington.

In Colorado, the Montrose-Durango District is at Montrose now, consolidated, with the retention of a field office at Durango.

We abolished the Spokane Land Office -- we haven't determined whether it will be a suboffice or a district office, but the situation in the State of Washington was this: we had only 250,000 acres remaining in the State, but surprisingly there was pressure to keep an office. Everyone is for economy but not in his area. We simply didn't have the volume of work to justify it; we showed this to the local people and they understood that we didn't have justification for the workload.

We made a number of advisory board mergers: New Mexico, 1 and 7, 3 and 4; Colorado, 1 and 6 at Craig; Colorado 5 and 8 at Canon City, Arizona, 2 and 3 to Phoenix. We also have moved the Denver District Office to Glenwood Springs, Colorado. This is to bring the field force closer to the work, closer to the land where the work is.

In addition to the decentralization of the district offices -- the one at Moab, Utah, and one at Kingman, Arizona -- we expect to have more. We aren't going to need any more men but we are trying to propose more money so that we can get the projects working, and for the present strength, travel time, travel costs -- both time and expense for the men who are going to have to be out on travel in order to be closer to the people and the land which they work.

The reorganization also involves one other change at the district level, the change to setting up staff and line. Up to now there was the district manager and the engineer, the range management people, the protection people, the land people, and so on.

Now we are setting up, very slowly, the resource manager who is, in effect, the local man who will be in charge of a particular part of the district. We are testing this out. It has been used in some parts of the Western States in varying degrees as a practical matter because the districts are so large that the district managers simply can't keep tract of everything that is going on. There are just too many people that are interested, and they have to drive too far to and from their district office; by having decentralization, we will be able to have better working arrangements for the people at the local level, and have the resource manager continue to maintain the staff, working on project designs, planning for particular projects coming from the assistant resource manager, and working with the resource manager.

This should provide a better service to the users and the public. It will place the responsibility with a specific individual. The real problem we have had in the past -- the cause of a lot of public frustration -- is the fact that this man simply couldn't know everything that was going on in his area. It was too big. By having men who are responsible for part of the district, these two or three men who know everything that is going on and are responsible for it. This organization also makes it easier to obtain the benefits of the specialists in administrative services to replace our operating managers right out on the land.

In addition to this organization, you heard about the Service Centers. The Service Centers are supporting staff services. Basically, in addition to providing administrative services in the field, they are set up to give greater technical depth to our work. One of the things that has been happening, as you know, in addition to the population explosion, is the knowledge explosion. I heard -- I don't know how reliable the source is -- that much more information has been accumulated since 1950 than has been accumulated all the time before; I still haven't checked the source, but this is scientific information.

This, of course, has a real impact on resource management, and means we have to have specialists who can give us detailed, precise information on just what kind of soil culture to apply to this particular

stand; what kind of grasses are appropriate for revegetation of this particular land area, and so on. The average busy administrator, who knows generally what these resource techniques are, cannot keep up with all of the developments that are taking place in every one of these special fields, so we are having a small group of highly trained men working on special assignments in the Service Centers.

In Washington, we have reorganized the staff -- the whole Washington staff -- as most of you know. There is a program management group who works right down through the States to the districts, and a recently established technology group which works through the Service Centers. We feel that this will give us the kind of multiple management that goes with multiple use. We have expanded our functions and we are largely confined to range, forestry and engineering, protection, to improve wildlife, soil and watershed management, and recreation, in which fields additional developments are taking place. We need to have people who understand and who can give guidance in practice.

Now, all of this adds up to how do we apply it to the land? We apply it to the land essentially through unit plans, multiple use unit plans, where we try to dovetail the various uses that are going on in the particular area, taking all the various pieces of information and put them together in one solid plan; getting the topographic information, the aerial photos, the inventories of forest lands, the range conditions and trend information, soil information, similar data; then we can have a solid foundation on which to build plans for the future with respect to the management of those lands which, through our classification process that Mr. Chandler will talk about, will essentially be set aside for multiple use lands.

Then, of course, in the areas that are disposal categories, we have another direction that we go in tying our planning in with the local governments, the counties, so that they can look forward to a pattern of rational development as the pressures come on the land.

I have skipped over a number of these pretty fast, but I want to go over a few more. We have had a development since our last meeting which, in effect, has changed our whole system of managing, or is changing it. It is in the process of managing our projects in relation to our programs.

This is called the "Planning,Programming, Budgeting System." It boils down to this: That everything that we spend money for, we must show what the results are, what the outputs are. This is a much more precise effort to come to grips with -- what actually are we going to get out of, say, building a road, or improving our range. What are the output values that are derived?

Some are measurable in terms of dollars and cents; others are not. Some are intangible -- not measurable in dollars and cents -- so we can't relate all the uses on any particular tract of land to various kinds of costs that it takes to administer. It has been quite an exercise to go through, and a very interesting one. It is going to be a very fruitful one if it will give us more precise means of using the public's money in a way in which the benefits are more precisely demonstrable.

Well again, as usual, a number of controversial situations have come up in the last few months.

I am going to go over one that the Council gave its support to last year and present the happy conclusions. This is the Geophysical Exploration Regulations. Here's multiple use that has been going on where the geophysical exploration crews of the oil and gas companies have been going on to the public land and in many cases, most cases, not doing serious damage, but in enough cases -- particularly contractors who are here today and gone tomorrow -- we have been left with problems of erosion and destruction of the vegetative surface, the development of roads which the public then uses, and so we have a situation where we have had no control. The livestock people and the timber people are expected to have some sort of a permit to use the public lands but so far the oil and gas people have not been brought into this orbit.

So, after the board's endorsement last year, we had several meetings with the oil and gas people to develop some regulations in accordance with the Federal Regulations of last September. Opposition began to develop from the oil and gas industry, so we held a meeting in December. It came out of that meeting that the problem was our regulations seemed to imply that they would have to reveal what they found in the ground; and, of course, they had spent a lot of money for it. This wasn't what we wanted to find out. What we wanted to do was to maintain some degree of regulation over the disturbance of the surface; in other words, place responsibility where it belonged. We usually had to spend public money to repair the damage when it occurred.

We had another meeting a week ago, last Friday, March 18, at which time we agreed to accept the general plan of the industry which had propose placing responsibility for giving BLM a notification before they went out on the land -- and it is a written notification -- and securing it with a bond. They would come into the district office, gave us a notification, the notification would say which complex they were working in; the district manager would say, "we have these improvements here," and "here is a situation to look out for." They would have a map, and then they would get going on the land, and when they got through they would come back and we would inspect the situation, erasing it from the bond if there had been no damage, or requiring restoration or replacing of any divot that had been knocked out in their golf game.

They seemed to be quite satisfied -- they seemed to be quite satisfied that we were not hungry bureaucrats out to try to control the oil and gas industry, but we were out to do a job and to try to maintain the land. I think we are now in a position to try out this program with their full cooperation.

Another program we have worked on -- you know, over the years in the sense of the question of just how much abuse is taking place on public lands, a couple of years ago we went out, defined the specific areas of where there were serious erosion situations that either came about through abuse or other factors that were nongeological; in other words, where there was accelerated erosion, where the fine cover was easily broken and marring of the surface was taking place.

We identified almost 45 million acres of land where there was a critical or severe erosion hazard, and six million where there was an extreme erosion hazard. And so, we have gone into an inventory and are beginning programs of restoration through the establishment of protective coverings. And, we have several test watersheds. One is the Indain Watershed near Grand Junction, Colorado -- and if any of you get into that area, I would suggest you see Keith Miller, the District Manager, and have him take you up there because there is all the difference in the world.

This is an aside. Here is an area that had been used as a holding and bedding-down area for livestock for many years and it was really beat up. They set up and developed a grazing area outside of the little watershed, planted grass, they fenced it off and regulated the grazing so that it was very, very well timed with the part of the season when it could be grazed without damaging the vegetation, put in a lot of gulley plugs, small reservoirs, and that area has just come back in

two years. It's quite a lot of satisfaction to see that these changes can be made by the management and without really hurting anybody and benefiting everybody.

Another controversy we have had is this Wyoming fence situation between the wildlife and the livestock people up there. It has been a rather heated situation which brought to head a much larger issue, the traditional user versus the increased demands and interests in recreation and wildlife. Briefly, what we have done now in this situation is we have the permission of the Secretary now to take certain actions which essentially are as follows: We are giving every range user written notice that any improvements constructed after the time of this notice, including fences, without prior written authorization as required by the regulations, will subject his lease or permit to cancellation; to give every range user to apply by September 30 for authorization for any improvements, including fences, for which authorization has not previously been formally sought. It also will be subject to cancellation of the permit or lease unless this happens, and we will give continued priority to identifying unauthorized fences which need modification in order to promote multiple use, but we want to work closely with the range users, the State Game and Fish Commissions, the land commissioners, the district advisory boards, and other interested local groups in developing modifications that are needed.

Now, this is not an effort to punish anybody. We have taken a lot of punishment on this ourselves. This is just an indication of the multiple use situation and, in the case of antelope, it has occurred - particularly with the antelope and sheep. It's an issue that revolves around the fact that the antelope just can't seem to jump a sheep-type fence unless we put on some modifications, and this is what we are, in effect, attempting to do. We are going to review each fencing situation with the permittees and see if we can't get some modifications to provide animal passage, particularly an antelope passage.

The wildlife program generally, in the Bureau, has been a lagging one and has needed some greater emphasis than has been given it to date. But now we are getting to the point where we are identifying the various areas of wildlife use. There are about 60 million acres in the twelve Western States where there are a number of important concentration areas, winter areas, and others. These we are going to be able to try to give more effective management than we have in the past and, in fact, this is designated a multiple use blending process.

We are also hoping to put more emphasis on wildlife conditions in Alaska where they have over 250 million acres; we have just two wildlife men on the job for that much land with a tremendous wildlife resource. We recognize that the States do have the responsibility for managing the game species. We have the responsibility for providing the habitat.

We may be modifying some of our previous structures in such a way as to provide for this balance of use.

Briefly on appropriations, we have been trying to keep the costs down, the appropriations down. We have come up this year with about a million dollars less than last year, and this is what we went into the Congress for. On revenues, the total this year would be 53.5 million dollars against 54.5 last year. The revenues of the Bureau overall for 1965 were 23 million dollars which were divided in several ways, as you know.

Now, our time is running out. One final word with respect to the Public Land Law Review Committee. Some of you were in Washington -- Gene Etchart was down there and John Hay attended the meeting -- at least they were there even if they didn't get in on all of it.

There are a number of conflicting situations that we are receiving. We have resolutions from State committees, various organizations, stating, in effect, that we ought to have a moratorium on the Public Land Laws pending recommendations of the Public Land Law Review Commission. One of the problems, of course, is how to administer these laws while the study is under way in terms of whether the laws are all right the way they are or whether we will have to change them.

It results in rather a confusing situation. We would like to see consideration by this Council to the whole question of whether some of the disposal laws should operate prior to the time when we can classify lands for disposition. We are questioning where the initative is; whether we wait for the applications to come in or whether to classify the land available for classification so it can be transferred under one law or another. I think we would like some expression from the Council on this matter. I think we can get into this either today or on Wednesday.

Well, that covers my report.

217-692 O-66—4

PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT IN THE RIVERSIDE DISTRICT

Discussion and explanation by Hall S. McClain, Manager, Riverside District and Land Office, Bureau of Land Management, before the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 28, 1966.

It is a pleasure to have the National Advisory Board Council here in Riverside. About a year ago we had the State advisory board down here and I think that they will say that they had a different look at some of the Bureau of Land Management programs and problems that they visualized before. I think that after the field trip tomorrow you will have some idea of the vastness of the Bureau programs that you did not realize existed.

The district office here in Riverside is both a land office and a district office. It is a merged office and there are only two others of this sort in the Bureau, the Anchorage Office in Alaska and the Fairbanks Office.

On this State map of California we have outlined the area of the land office responsibility which generally runs east of the Sierras and south of the Tehachapi Range. Also, I have outlined the area that we have surface responsibility for, which is in black, the southern end of the State, the five counties, San Bernardino, Riverside, Imperial, San Diego and Orange.

The area colored in yellow represents public domain land and there are several withdrawals shown on there. The areas where we have mineral responsibility retained rights by the government when lands pass are not shown on the map.

They are important -- I mean, that capacity is important, because those lands and rights have been undivided. For example, just this last week, we finally got the lease out on the oil under the Long Beach Post Office. There is 1.4 acres of land there; we had a bonus of $21,000 and there will be royalties running for several years. We have other retained oil rights throughout the district and those are continuing responsibilities even though we dispose of the surface resources.

Some of the basic facts about the district -- or scaling factors, as I call them in talking to other people and that represent jobs and work -- are that within the land office area we have 11 million acres of public domain. We administer the surface activities.

We have 1,200,000 acres of surface responsibilities and land office records for 11 million acres of public domain. We also have responsibility for maintaining land office records for some fourteen and a half million acres of reserved lands -- Park Service, Forest Service, Reclamation Bureau, and so forth. There are 73,000 acres of acquired lands and then there is unknown acreage of mineral reserve.

We also have the scaling factor of population. Brunel mentioned that we are increasing in California at the rate of 2,000 a day. Dr. Rostvold will tell you that within the Los Angeles area there are 1,000 a day, and 100 acres per day go from farm or agricultural production or wildlife into the taking care of these thousands of people in the form of housing, roads, rights-of-way, and so forth.

The district, the five counties, the dimensions on that we work, is 200 miles from the west side over to the Colorado River and a little over 200 miles from the north end of the San Bernardino County line down to the Mexican border. We handle that out of this one office, and this means a job in managing our field work.

We have practically all the resources mentioned in the classifications in the Multiple Use Act except timber. We have 170 grazing leases for some 3.5 million acres. There are various types of industrial uses, many of them rights-of-way for power lines, pumping stations and pipelines have been mentioned.

Our mining and mineral production is extensive. We have one of the largest iron mines in California, the Eagle Mountain Mine; we have cement plants requiring tram roads and tramways.

We have the various types of land occupancy and land need, land for growing communities and land for businesses.

We have the protection program in terms of fire protection. We are kind of lazy here compared to other districts in the Bureau in that we contract our protection.

We have quite a little area that falls into the category of acquired land, and probably our greatest challenges are the land itself. The values in it are for outdoor recreation, for wildlife, for the protection of public values, and one of our big jobs which we have before us, and which we have not scratched the surface of, is the protection, preservation and rehabilitation of the deserts themselves. They are in use and they have many values which we should take care of.

I think that after you have been on the field trip tomorrow you will realize that in southern California we have problems that are unique and more complex than anywhere else in the Bureau.

During the past year -- I want to show you another map, if I may -- we have segregated the district into management units or planning units. We have also grouped them into resource areas in the organizational structure.

We have been requested also to test one of our units in terms of planning and with the Classification Act. This unit was selected as I understand it, because of its remote location and because of the minimum basic information available, which is a fact, and also because we were working within a county, San Bernardino, which is very far advanced in its planning in the county zoning process.

Again, some of the dimensions in the planning unit, which is located on this map up in this area. It joins Nevada, but when we look at it here on a one inch scale map, it takes a little more form. There are 900 thousand acres of public land in the unit, 300 thousand acres of State and private land. The elevations in the unit range from 800 to 7,500 feet and that's typical of practically all of it.

All our areas are of wide geographic ranges. There are 900 thousand acres in small units. In this particular unit, the "Piute Unit," -- this is also unique ecologically. We have some of the lower elevations, the Colorado division of the Sonoran Desert; at the upper elevations the characteristics of the Mojave Desert and, finally, at the higher elevations, remnants of the Great Basin Desert, all in this one area. Manipulation of resources, range and otherwise, become quite complex because many times you get two or three ecological regions coming together and some of the rules and regulations you go by aren't typical. Portions of that ecological region do not fit.

In that unit there are ten grazing leases for 740 thousand acres. Of the commercial uses, there are 57 different rights-of-way. Under range improvements there are pipelines, mostly. We have wildlife there which is very important to California.

Many of our resources in California are important because while they may not be in particular numbers and the quality we think of in other areas, say Colorado or Idaho, they are here and the population is here.

People can get to them very quickly. The outer edge of this unit is four hours from downtown Los Angeles, four and a half hours. If you are on the freeway to Las Vegas on Friday night you realize people are in a hurry to get there because they go just a little bit faster.

Recreation in this unit and in the rest of the district is growing. There is a growing demand for it, the people are there and it is very diverse. It is especially important because you know in southern California we have long, comfortable winters. People can get out there and they can get up in the high country. In southern California we have people who have come from other Western States, and they are interested in outdoor activities so that they are out there every weekend.

We have proceeded in our planning on this unit, and some of the suggestions that have come up are an accumulation of the basic overlays and the basic mapping required has indicated that we need to do a bit more work on the 900 thousand acres before we are ready to come to any final conclusions.

But, there are some good suggestions. For instance, this yellow line, the yellow area long there, is the location of a freeway that has been proposed since we started our planning. We have these problems of looking forward to whether we are going to allow uses along there, what kind of uses, for instance, power lines, communication lines -- or whether we are going to let them come in there or whether we are going to require those people to, say, add additional lines and to stay within the boundaries that have already been established, or keep that new development on the old corridors.

Every off-ramp is indicated by these red points. If you look at any of the off-ramps along the California freeways you will notice that new industries and new housing have sprung up. This becomes quite valuable, so business that spills out makes a new value. We are working with the county on the idea of how many off-ramps should we in turn set up? Should we think in terms of looking forward to disposing of any land, or which areas based statistically on our findings of the highway department's needs -- how often are they needed, what the population expectation will be. Likewise, we may be antiquated in our thinking because we think in terms of providing the services off the freeways.

At some of the public highway meetings and recent Chamber of Commerce meetings, they spoke in terms of maybe widening the freeway, widening the lanes and putting islands, industrial islands in the middle for service, motels, restaurants, and so forth, so that the frequency of bars and whatnot that tend to create traffic problems could be controlled better. Maybe we shouldn't even plan anything towards the private development in the area of the off-ramps where public domain is involved.

We know in looking at this that we have a need to adjust our land patterns. There are several State sections in there, some of them critical situations for elevations, for wildlife management and access to the hunting areas, access to the water, and there are about seven or eight State sections which we believe we should plan for requiring a land pattern for future management.

This is more or less remote, or typical of our remote areas. We have about five of them across there and we call them "remote" but each one of them has a road streaming into it, very close to the freeway, and the people are easily finding their way to it. They are putting tremendous pressure on us so we have to plan our recreational thinking, long range plans for how we would handle that land and at the same time handle those people and accommodate the existing uses by livestock and the access that will be necessary in certain areas for industrial use.

Actually, we are, on this particular unit. It's on the way between Boulder Dam and some of the high power producing areas and the using area of Los Angeles so we know we have to provide industrial access.

I will close here. I know that Neil Pfulb has an interesting presentation on San Bernardino County. I do want to thank you for this opportunity to tell you of the Riverside District, which you will see tomorrow. You will see only a small portion of the district, but I think you will find it interesting.

A COUNTY GENERAL PLAN IN A PROTOTYPE COUNTY

Presentation by Neil B. Pfulb, Planning Director, San Bernardino County, California, to the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside California, March 28, 1966.

It is interesting that I have been asked to make a talk on planning before this group because it is almost exactly one year to the day that I made a presentation to the NACO Conference in Reno and to the Bureau of Land Management Conference there.

Now I have been asked to come back, and I certainly appreciate the opportunity before the National Advisory Board Council and to make this presentation.

My name is Neil Pfulb as it shows on the program. Don't let the name throw you. That "P" on the front a lot of times does and in the county there is kind of a humorous story that goes around about a situation that occurred in front of the Board of Supervisors not too long ago.

As you know, planners are sometimes in a position in front of the Board of Supervisors making recommendations that aren't particularly appreciated by an applicant anyway. This was the case: The applicant in making her presentation to the board, kept referring to me as "Mr. Flub," and repeatedly made that kind of a pronunciation and finally one of the board members smiled and said, "Ma'am, I believe you should know it's pronounced 'Pfulb,'" and she said, "Well, maybe it's 'Pfulb' to you but it's 'Flub' to me."

My assignment is to discuss a county general plan in a prototype county. I thought it would be interesting to look up the word "prototype." It means, "the original or model after which anything is formed, or, a primitive form." I don't believe either one really fits San Bernardino County too well. Most of you have gotten some conception from Hall McClain's description of the county that it hardly can be called a model in terms of size. It is the largest of any county in the United States, unless there is one recently in Alaska that I haven't heard of.

And, I don't believe it is a primitive form either because we have everything in the county from a highly developed, developmental metropolitan area to some of the most remote desert areas where you could easily become lost.

So, it is neither, but I believe the prototype undoubtedly had to do with what apparently was thought to be a relationship that the county planning process enjoys with the Bureau of Land Management and I'll try and describe that in explaining what a county general plan consists of.

Before I do that, I believe I had better define a county general plan, because you can get all kinds of definitions. It depends on the audience you are talking to as to what they feel a general plan is. It is like the lady who woke up in the middle of the night and found it was unbearably hot in the bedroom. Her husband had again closed the windows and opened the heat register and she went off to the living room and spent the rest of the night on the couch.

In the morning her four daughters came in and they ranged in age from five to something like sixteen and they wondered what she was doing there. She told them that "Daddy had insisted on closing the bedroom windows" and that it was too hot to sleep.

So, it was interesting then in the afternoon when she began getting a series of amusing telephone calls. The youngest daughter had announced during "Telling Time" in kindergarten, "Mommie is sleeping on the couch because Daddy is making it too hot for her in the bedroom."

It depends on the audience as to how you tell the story about the county plan. In this case I believe that it would be essential that I define a county plan in terms of what the state law in California says. It says as follows:

> "The general plan shall consist of a statement of development policies and shall include a diagram or diagrams, and text setting forth objectives, principles, standards and plan proposals."
>
> "The plan shall include the following:" Here it makes two essential requirements.
>
> "1. The land use element designating the proposed general distribution and extent of the various land use categories, including business, agriculture," and so forth, and
>
> "2. A circulation element consisting of the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, and other forms of transportation."

Now, these are the two essential elements that must show on the planned map for use in circulation, but it also requires that the planned map be accompanied by a report which sets out objectives, principles, standards that go with the plan and in discussing the land use development, it requires that we make statements concerning operations, density and housing. It's customary in doing so that planners make statements about population predictions that sometimes later they wish they hadn't made.

Finally, in San Bernardino County, and in following this State law, I think you can see that someone would have to interpret the State law fairly flexibly because we must be responsible for doing the planning for the various unincorporated communities, and this we have been doing by developing a series of different plans for the various communities. This is one for Arrowhead, we have one for Fontana -- we have developed these for different communities throughout the county. This is one level of general planning.

The next level that we are more concerned with here is the type of regional planning -- I refer to it as regional planning anyway -- which deals with large areas of the county and a region and which together, when they are completed, will make up a county general plan.

Within recent years we have had to shift from emphasis on community planning to emphasis on regional planning because the carrot is hung out in front of us, like everyone else, and we are required to complete a general plan for the entire county in order to be eligible for different types of State and Federal monies. So we have pulled out all the stops and in the last year and a half have been concentrating on this program of completing a general plan for this county, and we expect to be done by this fiscal year.

The emphasis in completing the plan in a hurry makes it necessary that we recognize, and admit, that in some cases the plan will be sketchy, will be very broad-brushed. Nevertheless, we are going to complete a general plan for the county so that we can comply with the State law, and Federal requirements.

This money gets to be a pretty important thing to local communities because it is necessary, and it seems that nowadays that money has a natural homing instinct for the U. S. Treasury so we have to get it back from there.

The general plan for the county of San Bernardino is divided into three study areas, and I will refer first to the map over here and outline the county rather than try to drop the map that we brought. The exhibit stage is not large enough.

This is the county. The valley area is right here; the mountain area is right here and the rest is the desert country. So, we have divided it essentially into valley, mountain and desert studies. The exhibit that is behind me is the general plan of the valley area. Now, that has been completed essentially because the County Planning Commission and Board have adopted the westerly portion of that plan and the east valley portion is now in hearings, pending hearings before the Board of Supervisors.

It is displayed because I wanted to illustrate a diagram that consists of the general plan as we see it. The colors on the map represent the different land in each category.

From the westerly boundary, which is the Los Angeles County boundary and the common boundary between Los Angeles County and San Bernardino, over through Yucaipa -- some of you may know that area in San Bernardino -- and from the northerly limits, the San Bernardino Mountains to Riverside County boundary, and the city of Riverside is about where I am pointing, so this is essentially the Upper Santa Ana Basin area and the valley that is being developed, primarily for urban uses.

Our approach within the valley area will be considerably -- has been considerably different because it will be in the mountains and the desert. Here we deal mostly with people and the way they use the land. The "urban explosion," as you might refer to it, is the emphasis here in how we are going to plan an orderly growth. The circulation element, highways, are shown in black tape.

There has been considerable emphasis on the population explosion. Certainly we have to be aware of this, but there are limits. I think it should be pointed out that even within the valley, even though we are predicting more than a 100 percent increase in 20 years, that we will still have available more than half of the area shown in yellow which we anticipate will be urban in the distant future. We will still have more than half of it available and, as I say, ready for use, so we will still have room.

The blue area that you see there, related mainly in the center of the valley, lying westerly of Kaiser Steel, and in the area around San Bernardino over here related to Norton Air Base, we will still have about half of that land available for industrial expansion, even in 20 years.

I might explain some of the other colors. The yellow indicates urban uses. This would include all urban uses, residential, shopping, business, neighborhood facilities such as schools and the necessary supporting services facilities are there, included all in that one color.

The blue represents industrial; the green represents agricultural and the olive drab color represents "permanent open" or conservation areas.

You might be curious as to why we show agriculture even in the face of this growth. As I have indicated, we will still have room in the valley to accommodate many more people in 20 years, and we feel it's important then to protect those agricultural areas that are now producing a sizeable economic base to San Bernardino County and to protect it from urban encroachment. In a way, this is the same as land management on public lands.

In the area over around Redlands, you see a crosshatch of green, yellow underneath and then green crosshatching. This expresses a compromise. This essentially is a productive citrus area now surrounding the city of Redlands. Because of the values on the land there and the pressure for urban expansion, we expect that that area will give way to urban development within a twenty-year period, but because the citrus is a valuable economic asset and worthy of preservation as long as possible, the green crosshatch identifies it, and the text of the report will set out the policies of the county and the city to protect it. One of them is, of course, that as development occurs it should be incremental, gradually into the area rather than the hop, skip and jump-type that went out into the middle of these productive citrus areas.

This sketches then some of the essential things in the valley planning. We expect to begin hearings on that plan within a month and a half.

We call the mountain area the conservation area because the primary emphasis here will be on conservation, more and more wilderness areas, recreation. The primary emphasis will be, how do we accommodate over 8 million visitor days in the year in that area and still effect the preservation of the asset and the natural resources that the people are going there to enjoy.

We recognize that the plan will have to account for a sizeable amount of private land in the mountains that will be developed in urban uses and, so, essentially the emphasis on the mountain plan. The area plan, which we will call a conservation area, will be beyond that particular point and at least it might be compared to the developing plan in the desert. We are incorporating that in the text of the report and impressing on the map the management policies of the National Forest Service. We have gone to considerable length to try and communicate these policies and they will be expressed in the report because it is essential that local government understands the administrative policies so that private lands that are related thereto can be properly coordinated and the uses are properly coordinated with the uses in the National Forest plan.

Then, also, on that same plan, will be the flood control element that would be shown in the valley floor. The watershed area itself in the mountains contributing to the potential flooding in the valley, and showing on the plan itself, and will show the systems of floodways that are proposed in the valley in order to accommodate this runoff as well as the water conservation measures.

Now, in the desert -- I wish I could show you a preliminary plan because I believe this is the item that is of most concern, but I cannot do that. I brought along some study maps but there isn't room to put them up.

We are in the process of developing this land, and in consultation with Hall's office. We expect that in the desert the type of plan we develop there will be what might be comparable to a State development plan. After all, we are dealing in an area as large as four Eastern States put together.

So, there the general plan will be a broad-brush type of plan identifying as best we can the pilot lands, and, within those, the sort of special categories, and then the public lands including the State as well as the Federal, and within that framework try to express on the plan and in the text of the report how we would handle urban concentrations and where we expect them to occur; where our agricultural areas are now and how we expect to preserve them and, possibly, if there are potential additional agricultural lands that we should plan

for and protect; where industrial and natural resource areas are; recreation will be a major emphasis on that plan, identifying where the major recreation uses are now and where the potential one will be. And, I might say here that the county is well along in actually, officially adopting its recreation element, the regional; a general plan for the regional parks in the county has already been approved by the planning commission and is pending hearings before the Board of Supervisors. This has been coordinated with the Bureau of Land Management.

Then, there will be various special classes of land use on the desert. Some of them are new towns and highway corridors. These are typical of the special classes that we must use.

The circulation element will show, of course, the highways, railroads and airports, and in this case the highways are representative of the fact that San Bernardino County is a corridor for much of the incomin traffic into the State, and aptly so for San Bernardino County because this adds one of the largest economic businesses in the desert area. This is the tourist industry and this also should be expressed and clearly brought out in the plan itself.

The essential elements of the plan then have been sketched -- I am trying to hurry through this because we are way behind time. The plan, I might emphasize, can and must be more than a pretty map with a lot of symbols on it. It must define the goals and the objectives and the problems and also implement solutions to the problems. If it does not do these things it is not a general plan because it is not a comprehensive plan.

In conclusion then, a year ago -- as I say, when I met with the NACO Convention in Reno -- I referred to new regulations and policies of the Department of the Interior which foster closer cooperation with local governments and reflect an awareness on the part of the Department of the Interior that their management policies affect both governments, and that they are willing to be guided by the opinions of the cities and the counties if they will do their homework. Certainly, if we don't, then we have no right to complain. We should prepare our plans for our various jurisdictions and in devising them to try as best we can to also coordinate with the various Federal offices.

And finally, the important function then of the general plan, in the final analysis, is to improve understanding between the private sector and government and to improve communications between the different levels of government. I sincerely hope that our general plan program, when completed, will do a better job than a recent telephone call did from a little old lady in Ohio who was trying to reach her Congressman's secretary.

She was somewhat startled when the receptionist said, in a sweet voice, "No, she's not here now. She's down on the floor with the Congressman."

GRAZING FEES - A PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Presentation by Glen Fulcher, Chief, Range Staff, Bureau of Land Management, to the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 28, 1966, and ensuing discussion.

In looking at this room, undoubtedly it has been used as a church. My first thought was that I couldn't think of a more inappropriate place to discuss grazing fees than a church -- but on second thought, maybe we are missing a bet. If you all offer up some prayers, maybe we will get some Divine Guidance as to how to solve our grazing fee problems.

Mr. Anderson certainly covered the meeting well that we had last night, and because of time limitations I don't think we will be able to go over the full scale evaluation into the grazing fees because we don't want to use up all your time. But, I think we will need to back up and review a few of the things that were mentioned last night.

To start with, we are under a very stringent directive from the Bureau of the Budget, which is backed by the administration, to move for fair market value for all user charges of our national resources, and of course, this also includes grazing fees.

In that directive, they told us that we should look for fair market value as determined by competitive bid and by appraisal rates that we get on private lands or lands on which competitive bids were offered. So,I think that in any grazing fee issue we look to, we have to start with the idea of fair market value because if we use any other approach, I don't think we will get to first base in trying to sell it. Also, I think this is a very reasonable approach.

If you live east of the Mississippi River and you have never been out West and you heard that the Bureau of Land Management lands were going at 23 cents and private land of comparable value was going at $2 to $3, you, as a citizen, would be questioning why, why it is true. And, we must tell you the difference but we have never really sat down and defined what this difference really is, that there is a difference in fair market value on public lands as compared to fair market value on private lands.

217-692 O-66—5

So, in any approach we take, we have to come up with what is fair market value for this if we ignore all institutions and all things that happened in the past. Then, I think, we can come in on this fair market base and say, "How much can we adjust this fee because it is in public ownership and it is under a privileged system."

Now, in looking at some of these factors, we find that there are differences in the cost involved in renting out public lands versus private lands, and I think a renumerator -- I might put on the board here an example of a study made for us in Utah -- it is called "Discovering Grazing Values" by N. K. Roberts and Mardell Tophan. Both the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management put money into this study and it is continuing at Utah. It is a progress report in which they have made a study of what it costs to run on public lands and what it costs to run on comparable private land in Utah.

These are some of the results that they came up with that would give you some idea of what we are discussing when we say "What is the difference in operating on public lands versus the cost in operating on private lands."

What they did was, they looked at winter desert range in Utah for cattle and they said, "What does it cost to run on this land, on the public lands?" So, it turned out that the fee is 30 cents. That was last year, and this is the price that the Bureau of Land Management was charging, 30 cents.

But, they also checked to find out what did the man pay for, or what was it worth, to have the permit to be out there, and they checked on various and sundry permit values and what they had sold for in recent times and they found that for a permit to run a cow out on the public lands for five months, in so-called "perpetuity," as long as it was in public ownership, it cost $60. In other words, it cost $12 per month, per permit value, to be out on that public land.

Well now, this is $12 that he has paid. If he has borrowed the money he is paying interest on it; or, if he didn't borrow the money, he could have invested it somewhere else where it would have been earning him a return. So, at 6 percent, this $12 is costing him 72 cents a year, so he is paying 72 cents a year for just the right to be out there.

Now then, they also checked other costs and they found out that death loss ran 52 cents per AUM; herding costs ran 44 cents per AUM; hauling and traveling -- this is hauling livestock and traveling out to check on the stock, and everything -- came up to be 46 cents. Then there were other costs involved that result from the fact that the private operator furnishes the fences, furnishes the water and furnishes a lot of these factors that you have to furnish on public land. The operator quite often furnishes the contributions for range improvement; he furnishes maintenance and operation and water haul costs, and this sort of thing, so we found out that these other costs amounted to 79 cents.

When we totaled those up, we found that it is costing this operator $3.25 per AUM to run on public land, even though he was only paying us 30 cents.

We also know that they had these costs if they ran on private land, so let's see what the results were on private land.

We found that the grazing fee was $2.07. They were paying the private landowner $2.07 per AUM to run on public land, but they didn't have to have a base economy, they hadn't paid for the right to do that so that there was no permit cost involved. They did have death losses, but death losses were less, and normally you would expect death losses to be less on private lands because usually it is better fenced, there is better management, less rustling, fewer poisonous plants. It came out to be 42 cents with the death loss on private land.

On herding, with your fences and better control, the herding cost was less. It was 28 cents. Hauling and traveling turned out to be about the same. It actually turned out to be 47 cents.

But these other costs were furnished, the fencing, the watering, and so forth were furnished, so there weren't any other costs involved. In this particular example then, the cost was $3.24 per AUM to run on public land.

private

If that had not been developed by Utah State University, I would swear that the livestock industry brought up the pitch.

But, I don't want to leave you with the picture that it all turned out this way. That was just one example, and it was just on the winter desert range.

Let's look at spring-fall foothill range. Again, on BLM it costs 30 cents. For some reason the permit value didn't cost this much. There must not be the demand for permit in that area because permit value was only $8.52 per AUM which, capitalized at 6 percent, came out 52 cents. Death losses were 47 cents; herding was less, 29 cents; hauling and traveling was 70 cents; and other costs were less, 52 cents. It must have been in an area where they didn't have to haul water as much as maybe out on your winter desert range. There was a total cost of $2.80 for using the public lands.

Then they looked at the private land and they found out that the grazing fee ran $2.30. There were no permit value costs; death loss was less, 34 cents. For some reason, in this particular area, the herding costs were quite a bit more, 48 cents on private land. You certainly wouldn't expect that. There might be some extenuating circumstances that would explain it.

Hauling and traveling in this case was much less, 40 cents, and, again, the other costs were furnished, and the cost of using private land was $3.52.

Here, you see where as near comparable ranges as they could find, evaluating all the costs that they thought were pertinent and important, they came up with a difference of $2.80 versus $3.52 on public lands where, on the one, it was $3.25 versus $3.24 using public lands.

But, our feeling -- and I think it's also the major feeling of the industry -- is that if we can get this information on all of our public land, as much as we possibly can for each district, we will then have a basis for educating the public; the sportsman, the administrator, the livestock operator, and the recreationist, so that when someone says, "You're being subsidized out there," -- well now, let's take a look. Actually, are you being subsidized?

Some of you might say, "Well, this permit value, that's a windfall to us." Initially, it was a windfall. When we set up a system that underpriced our grazing fees at 5 cents per AUM value when we started, we had enterprises, we had a rash of comments so that in economics we always find out that if you hold the price down for some institutional control, there will be some other way of getting the price up, and the way to get the price up was through the permit value.

We decided we would try to find out what percent of the permit values had been sold in the market, how many had actually paid for this permit, and we found out that 68 percent of our permits had been sold. Now, this means that they have gone on the market; somebody has paid for them.

So then, when you are talking about the individual rancher, and you say that he is being subsidized for being out on the public land, he has paid for this permit. There might still be some differences in value but subsidy is not the difference between 33 cents or 30 cents and $2.07, or 30 cents and $2.30.

This is on something we can layout and show the Bureau of the Budget; we can show the administrators; we can show everybody that this is the pictue as it exists on public land and for this reason there is a marked difference between the private range and the public range.

We think that if we can get this information gathered and if we can meet with you people in the districts, and with the local boards, after we get the data, we can evaluate it with your boards to come up with a reasonable agreement that these are the cost figures for your particular area. After that, we can come up with some agreement as to what the fee should be in relation to what the price is for the area.

We have set up a proposed timetable that I would like to pass out. The approach that we would take would be that in most cases we would propose the average carrying capacity for each BLM district. We would try to come up with a single fee for the district.

Where we have a district that is widely diversified and we have a great variation in vegetative types, we might have to have as many as two or three fees per district, but we would hold them down as much as possible.

This has advantages in that it will not penalize the man who goes in and does his best to improve his range because he will be charted on the average. It might penalize the man who will be using it -- but then maybe he needs to be penalized for it -- so, on the average fee that we will be using, you will not be penalized because you are paying on the average.

We also think this will not result in an unnecessarily large number of fees -- we are not sure yet -- but we don't think that it will give us a great number of fees; but it will, we think, give us a variable fee based on the value of the range in the particular area.

Because of the pressure that we are under to complete this study and be ready to go by 1967 with a new fee base, we have set up the following proposed schedule:

We hope by the first of May to have reached a decision as to a firm approach as to whether we will go on this method or not; but if not, what other method are we going to come up with. We think that by May 1, we have to have a decision as to how we are going to go.

By the middle of July, we would like to meet with the Assistant Secretary and show him, from the data that we have, approximately what that picture looks like as to what the fee might be. We realize we won't have sufficient data to give him all the final answers, but we should be at least able to indicate what it looks like we are going to have.

By October 1 we hope to have all of our data collected. By November 15 we hope to have it all analyzed and ready for presentation to local boards, both for discussion purposes and for their evaluations and their comments.

Between November 15 and December 31, we will have time for these discussions.

By January 1 we will have the fee proposal to put in the budget. We would like as near a firm fee as possible.

Then, from January 1 to March 1, we would continue to work to revise this to bring it to a head, to put the Departmental publication into effect on March 1.

This, then, is the schedule that we propose, and this is the approach that we would like to take. I assume you would like Mr. Helming to briefly discuss his proposal, but it appears that the basic approach, except for some of the details that we got into on giving our attitudes, and so forth, are in agreement as to gathering this data. This agreement might result in how to evaluate it, but at least we will have the data -- we will have it before us and we can all make a sound decision, judgment as to what should be our approach, once the data is available.

But always in the past, we have talked about grazing fees without really having the total picture before us. This is giving us a real good opportunity to have the total picture, and we are going to present it to everybody, both in the industry and the public.

I would like to pass this schedule out. I would like you to consider that it was typed rather hurriedly and there are some errors, two errors.

When you get it, in the second paragraph, will you put a period after "permits," "grazing permits." It's in the second paragraph under "Summary," "... in using public land grazing permits." There should be a period after that and a capital on "such," a capital "S" on "such."

And then, down under "A," "Some of the factors to be used in adjusting for Federal land operations," the first word -- she couldn't read my writing and she put down "mending," and I meant "herding," so it should be "herding" instead of "mending."

Well, I think that that is all the time we have.

MR. ANDERSON: To begin with, are there any of the members who would like to ask a question of Dr. Fulcher here?

MR. RAY LINCOLN, IDAHO: How do you propose to keep this current? These costs will vary from year to year, as you realize, and what is your proposal to keep them current?

DR. FULCHER: Well, I think we will have to come up with some agreement on this. Certainly, we wouldn't want to do this every day in the year.

Now, we might be able to plug something into the statistical reporting service in the future that would provide us this data. If not, I don't think we ought to look at it more than every fifth year or so, except for the livestock prices.

MR. LINCOLN: "Except for the livestock prices." Would you explain how this would fit into this then?

DR. FULCHER: I didn't want to get into the details because this is where we started getting into arguments last night, but you know at the present time we take the average price of the livestock for the last year, and this is an adjusting factor for raising or lowering the fee. This probably will still be a factor to look at in any kind of a formula we are trying to come up with, so that we would probably have to look at that much more often than some of the other factors that would have slower tendency to change.

MR. J. LEONARD NEAL, ARIZONA: I would like to know where you got the figures you came up with.

DR. FULCHER: The figures in this particular example came out of this "Discovering Grazing Values" by N. K. Roberts and Mardell Tophan at Utah State.

MR. ROBERT V. THOMPSON, WYOMING: What would you use for a base for the private operator in an area like Wyoming where you own 90 percent of the land, for the spring pasture?

DR. FULCHER: This is going to cause some real problems. Nevada, of course, 85 percent of the whole State is going to be hard to arrive at private fee rates, but I think we will be able to get them.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, in putting many of their reservations up for lease, put them up for competitive bid, but before they do that, they make an appraisal of private lease rates in the area that are comparable. I was real surprised -- they have done this throughout New Mexico. In the areas we looked at, they had found the basis for a private lease rate base.

They also have Indian reservations in Nevada, and they came up with a base in those areas, so I am sure that if we look hard enough that we will find one. We won't have as many as we would like to have.

MR. ANDERSON: Incidentally, last evening there was a good deal of interest shown in and questions about the makeup of the group -- the interdepartmental group -- that will be making this study.

DR. FULCHER: The interdepartmental committee is made up out of the Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, and they are directed to come up with a grazing fee base for 1968 that would be a standard base for all Federal lands.

There are several agencies involved, but if you start to analyze them, you find that only the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have moved into an institutional permit type grazing fee survey. The others are almost exclusively on some kind of a fair market value, either by competitive bid or by appraisal method.

So, although the others are interested, they don't take too active a part because they don't want to change their system of competitive bids. This does mean the Department of Defense will come up with a fair market value, so it falls back to the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management; they are going to have to come up with a standard basis for fees. This doesn't mean that their fees are all going to be the same, but on the same basis to determine the fee. There are approaches that are very similar to this, and I am sure that this will fit nicely into the system that we come up with in the interdepartmental committee.

On this interdepartmental committee,we have also invited an ex officio member from the Bureau of the Budget, so that we can get him in there and educate him in some of the problems that we face in coming up with fair market values, and try to get across to him that there isn't a big difference between the 30 cents and the $2.07 when you take into consideration all the other factors involved.

MR. FRANCIS A . LeSOURD, WASHINGTON: Couldn't you use sales data, how the sales data is going to be reflected on the balance of these lands? It would be a help because of the dearth of information on hand.

DR. FULCHER: We would have to be real careful, because these lands sell for all kinds of reasons besides grazing, and I think you will find that high-priced land leased out for grazing still doesn't get back what it should in relation to the price that was paid. You would have to be real careful if you used sale price as the basis for determining what the grazing lease rate would be.

MR. LeSOURD: Do these costs that are coming into the Bureau of Indian Affairs reflect these excess costs for the leasing of private land?

DR. FULCHER: This is something we will look into. In some cases we have found that when they bid for something, they still have to furnish maintenance, they still have to furnish a lot of these other factors, so we find that in a lot of these bids with the Indian service that essentially they are getting the same thing they are getting from us except they don't have to maintain a base property and they don't have to pay for a permit to be out.

MR. LeSOURD: Well, those bids don't come in under the private range property.

DR. FULCHER: We would certainly want to use these as a guide; there is a lot of information here that is very valuable to us because of the shortage of information that we are faced with.

MR. LeSOURD: Briefly, what are some of the other costs involved in this?

DR. FULCHER: The main costs that are involved are private contributions to public lands and range improvement.

A second one is, we have something over 265 thousand miles of fence in the Bureau of Land Management and something in the neighborhood of 90 percent of this fence is maintained by the operators.

We have I don't know how many hundreds of springs, water developments, and so forth, that the operators maintain. You see here is a cost, one of the costs involved.

It's principally water haul, contributions for range improvements and maintenance cost.

MR. LeSOURD: Where does wildlife charge enter into this?

DR. FULCHER: There is no charge in here for wildlife because we would still allow for determining how many of the animals were allowed in there in giving consideration for wildlife needs. The wildlife are in there and our wildlife needs are in and above whatever we allow to be grazed.

MR. HENRY C. GERBER, OREGON: I have two questions.

In the first place, you mentioned the $60 value being the permit value. Now, is that the State of Utah? The reason I ask you that question is, in one State, for instance, if you apply that against the property to have the privilege of gaining one AUM and one AUM costs you $200 or $300, and in another State it costs you $800 or $900, are you considering that?

DR. FULCHER: We are trying to consider that; we are making value separate from the base. In other words, where we can find a lot of transfers, or permits for transfers from one place to another, the man in buying knew that he had to have a place for it before he could transfer, so what is it worth in view of the fact that he has got the base value. That's what we are looking for.

MR. GERBER: What he paid for it?

DR. FULCHER: The thing we are looking for is the sale price of the permit value.

MR. MARK WAGNER, COLORADO: On a withdrawal such as for economy or something such as future development in ten years, is a grazing fee attached to this withdrawal area to be considered in time?

DR. FULCHER: I don't know the basis for the withdrawal but in a lot of these cases, unless the land is immediately going into some specific other use, the grazing continues until such time as the grazing interferes; if they continue to graze the area, they would be charged a grazing fee.

MR. NOLAN F. KEIL, NEVADA: If they continue to make improvements on public lands, would that be adjusted for the private land figure?

DR. FULCHER: I think it would. In other words, if the government were to get the money to provide all the other costs, that is, if we provided all the maintenance, all the water that was needed, certainly then we would be able to add this part to the fee. But, will we get those appropriations, and when? As we get more and more in this area, I would guess that there would be some adjustments made, but, again, I don't think that we would want to do this more than once every five years.

MR. GEORGE RICCA, ARIZONA: Pursuing further along Mr. Gerber's question on the cost of the permit, it would appear that instead of a $60 figure that it probably would be from $300 to maybe $800 because I think these cases are rather isolated cases that have been found where AUM's are transferred from one base to another unless they are available. And they are available but a growing unit is costing far more throughout the West. In other words, the investment in these AUM's is far more than is indicated by your figures.

DR. FULCHER: First, we would use the data that we have available, but what I think you are talking about is when you say $300 and $800 is like the total ranch. You mean the base property is involved, too. We want to separate the permit value from the ranch value.

MR. RICCA: Well, that's true; however, in some of these desert operations where you get only a few hundred acres, the land involved then, of course, would not be an important question.

DR. FULCHER: Even in your desert operations where you have a water base -- of course, we couldn't allow additional costs for keeping up your water because that's your base. This couldn't be charged off against your fee because of the requirement to keep up the water as to the base. But again, you don't separate your base property from the permit values. It will be harder in the water base areas.

MR. RICCA: Well, there appears to be a necessity for quite a little research to arrive at that figure and I rather think it's too low at the present time.

DR. FULCHER: This is one thing we get because of the large amount of transfers we do have. For example, in some States like Colorado, you might have as much as 10 percent of your permits turned over annually and a lot of them are to actually transfer from one property to another.

MR. GERBER: The reason I brought up these values and mentioned property, is that, for instance, if you apply for only $200 as the value of your property, or you apply for $800, you are actually paying your debt to society through taxes to the local government on your $800 value and that you are not paying it on the $200 value. Possibly the fee should be different because of the fact that you are paying indirectly -- not directly -- to the government, but to the government nevertheless and to society.

DR. FULCHER: Say that you had your $800 valued property and you didn't have enough public land and you have to rent from your neighbor. Does he pay any attention to what you pay for your land?

MR. GERBER: No, but you rent that anyway.

DR. FULCHER: I know this is right, you don't have to pay twice for the right to be on that public land.

MR. GERBER: That is just what I am talking about. You have to pay for a right to be on that public land. If you own $800 permits for that property, you are paying a lot more than if you own $200.

DR. FULCHER: I certainly can't argue with that. You probably have other property, too. You have something that has a resale value and it can increase in value. You undoubtedly paid a high price for it, and I don't think you can make any money after paying that price for it.

MR. BRUNEL CHRISTENSEN, CALIFORNIA: I appreciate the program that we have and I think we can get to work on this, but there is one thing that I was wondering.

You make a statement that the Bureau of the Budget and the administration are going to insist on user fees on all uses on public lands. Did I understand that right?

DR. FULCHER: That's right, and we also, of course, are studying the recreational needs.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: And the oil and gas leases will have the same type of schedules?

DR. FULCHER: I am not sure the schedule is exactly the same, but we are directed to come up with a recreation, oil and gas lease, in all these areas, actually.

In fact, we are going to have to charge a lot more for our recreation areas this year than we did last year. This is an increasing trend.

MR. BRUCE BOWLER, IDAHO: I think this is a very fair approach, and I am glad to see it. However, I think the value of the whole study depends on the accuracy of the figures that you have to get.

Now, you spoke of going to the local advisory boards and asking them for advice on these costs to arrive at these figures. Could you give us the mechanics that you have in mind of arriving at these costs?

DR. FULCHER: Maybe I misstated the case. I think that what we will do is try to make a study and come up with figures for your area, then take them to your advisory board for your consideration as to how valued you think they are.

We would be open to a tremendous amount of criticism if we got all this data just by working with the advisory boards, so we will try to make an unbiased study to get the data and then present the data to you people to see if you think it is a way out of line. Then we will try to check it, but the idea is to give you a showing and see what these figures are and see what you think of them.

DR. ARNOLD BOLLE, MONTANA: I am sorry I missed the discussion last night. I got here late, but this seems to me like a very constructive approach. I am glad to see the discussion here, the interest that it's arousing.

But, in your discussion here, before you go on with this, I think a great deal depends on how this is approached and how much confidence you are going to have in it.

Now, I think you can reach an agreement here that these figures might be between the BLM and the advisory boards, but you are going to be subject to examination by a lot of people outside, certainly the Bureau of the Budget. They are very fishy-eyed on this stuff, as everybody knows. There will be other interested groups following this and looking at this very carefully, suspiciously.

I'd like to suggest the idea that perhaps there should be some -- if you can get anybody who is not directly interested -- to get some of the study and take some of the responsibility, get -- I think you might have to pay a fee here if I advertise the university -- but these figures you got here came from Utah State which is one of the outstanding range schools.

There is a possibility here, and I would like to suggest that perhaps you should call in some outside people so that perhaps you would have a broader base and I think it would strengthen the whole program.

DR. FULCHER: I couldn't agree with you more, Dr. Bolle. I am quite worried about coming up with data that is going to be accused of being biased. For this reason, we really do need to look for an outside source to get as much of this information for us as possible, and we could say, "Well, we didn't get the data. The Livestock Commissioner gave us the data. These are the facts that were found by as qualified people as we could find."

We do have a problem here when you start talking about a study of the magnitude that it is going to take to get some of this information. When you take a new organization that has to gear up and get set, get its people ready to go -- we did a little exploring around and found out that if a half million dollars was available, they don't bat an eye in asking you for money in this neighborhood. This is a lot of money and when you haven't planned for that type of an appropriation in your budget, you don't have the money, but I think we do need to look as much as possible for outside sources to get this information.

I would never use this example if the livestock industry had developed it or if we had because it looks bad, but where we think we have an unbiased group of figures, I would feel very happy about using this type of an example and I would feel very happy and glad that it came out the way it did.

MR. RICCA: Do you know of any consulting firms that would take these economic feasibility studies under consideration, and if they did and came into the area, would the Bureau of Land Management accept their report?

DR. FULCHER: We have checked into some consulting firms. Most of them that are big enough to handle the job are -- or that we have heard of, I should say -- are east of the Mississippi River and you have got a lot of people who find it hard to understand the problems of the West.

Now, if we get into a private consulting firm, and somebody suggested maybe Stanford Research Institute or some of these organizations, they really charge money but at least they have western people who are somewhat familiar with western conditions and I think they would be more acceptable than people who haven't worked with it.

MR. RICCA: Would our local, State universities make the studies?

DR. FULCHER: I think this is a real opportunity, although having been in a university before, I realize how slow they move; the cog wheels of the university don't turn very fast, and to get geared up to get people to get going is a problem.

DR. BOLLE: You have a real problem here with your timetable if you have to have some of the information this week. I doubt if you could get Stanford or anybody to do any better than that. You might get a preliminary study, you might get an association between a few universities and have each one put in a certain amount of time to get a certain number of things done by a certain time schedule, the preliminary work, at least.

DR. FULCHER: There is this opportunity. As you approach the summer session, jobs are quite available for these students, but quite often you can get some of your junior and senior students to work for you in the summertime on some of these problems that are quite knowledgeable about what they are doing. It might be that we could work up some kind of a crash program that we would get the universities to help us out through this approach, like we quite often in the West have what we call "regional research." We take our regional problems in the western United States and all the States get together and work on certain portions of the problems.

They developed this because they found out that the States were all working on the same problems in their own bailiwicks and they weren't cross-supervising these ideas and they were doing a lot of duplication. So, they moved into what they call "regional research," which is a regional approach. I guess we could work something out, but again, there is the problem of money, and where do you get it?

DR. GERHARD N. ROSTVOLD, CALIFORNIA: I think it's quite clear that the job has to be done and the government is more or less on the table, and what you are going to have to do is undertake this on a sample basis.

If you get some preliminary benchmarks -- and I think that one of the basic ground rules of this group should be that we are not going to take a preliminary sample finding as being gospel truth in either direction and we should at least look at some benchmarks and carry the deliberations forward from there.

There are some very good economic consulting firms in the West and I think the Bureau should crank up to do this job on a sample basis, I mean, a pilot study technique; get a good look at it this fall and then perhaps bring the facts to the full Council and take it from there. I don't think that we can turn away from the problem.

I will drop one little footnote that I know the Bureau of the Budget is going to bring up, and that is this: That in the case of the public lands there is some reinvestment of public funds and you are going to have to face, as a Bureau, this very sobering question. The Bureau of the Budget, and namely, is it their judgment, you see, to prepare these cost inputs right straight across without making adjustments for the investment of public funds in public lands. You may have done this, but I am not sure the job can be done.

DR. FULCHER: No, I haven't. That is a very good point. It certainly is.

DR. ROSTVOLD: The Bureau of the Budget will raise the question, I am sure, so -- I think we can get the names of some of the consulting firms that might be more familiar with the conditions of the West and at least get them to do this on a pilot basis.

DR. FULCHER: In spite of the question of this coming back, it is still the cost to the individual, and I think this is one of the main things we are trying to show here, what he is actually paying.

DR. ROSTVOLD: I am merely indicating you had better anticipate the question because there is going to be argument on the other side that this should be a minus factor in determining the true economic cost of the public land. I have no position on this measure to indicate that this is going to be one of the aspects of nonprobability that the Bureau is sure to raise.

DR. FULCHER: The more of these questions that we bring up and get out on the table and think about, the better, because we are going to have a real critical look at everything that goes in here and we want the best thing we can get on them.

JUDGE LLOYD REA, OREGON: Take a project such as Vale. What bearing will this have on the total cost across the board here? We have a project such as where you are spending 16 million dollars, and other areas in the United States, too, because some, they are very much the same projects. The planning is very much the same.

DR. FULCHER: Well, it will be due to the fact that you have got that carrying capacity but we are spending 16 million dollars out there not to raise grass. Grass is a by-product of our whole approach and we are using the grass that we do develop to intensify our management of the total area. So to the extent that the carrying capacity in the Vale District can be increased, say -- I am just using this figure -- 20 acres to 6 acres, then we should be able to show in private lease rates what 6 acre ranches are worth compared to 20, and it should be higher for a 6 acre ranch; therefore, this should be a higher base figure here, there should be a higher difference over here. The fees should be higher. This should be the relationship.

MR. GEORGE N. SWALLOW, NEVADA: I am very encouraged by this approach. The question arises in my mind if this is brought to a conclusion and adopted on variable fees on base agreed on, what assurance will the industry have that we can rely on this base from here on out?

As you will remember, there has been a number of these studies made in the past and when the industry, along with the Department, worked out the base type of livestock some years back, then here about three years ago the Department, so to speak, "took a sword and cut the golden knot" and upped the percentage.

What is there to stop the Department from doing the same thing in this approach. Although the other approach may have been slightly more arbitrary, again there was a lot of detailed study went into the background. I am just wondering what assurance the industry might have that after this is adopted, what we can rely on as a basis, because once we get on the variable fee, we are no longer going to take positions one way or the other on being in unison. It will be up to the individual right down almost to the permit.

DR FULCHER: There is a good chance that this will be a long lasting measure, because we are approaching it from fair market value whereas we have never done it before. This is a directive. The way we looked at it before, we came up with some kind of an increase and we said, "Well, the price of beef, we will average one pound." This didn't tell us anything about the fair market value, you see, so it goes to the thinking that this is fair market value and it will give us a strong basis.

I think as an example of what we might be able to look forward to, is that the Forest Service took four years in developing an appraisal system in the 1920's that went into effect in 1931 and it is still in effect today. They haven't had this traditional cost argument about grazing fees because they worked out a system and it was acceptable for a long period of time.

Now they believe it is outmoded, and I believe it is outmoded, too, because they used a lot of factors that just don't fit any more in our bargaining society.

But they are proposing to move in the same areas as we are; we are moving together, and I think once we get this across then the Forest Service will be on the same kind of a footing and we can put the grazing fee to rest. Maybe that's that little prayer that I mentioned earlier.

MR. ROY YOUNG, NEVADA: You are saying now that your fee would probably go on and you would figure the difference in percentage between your private land and your BLM land, then coordinate that into the value of that livestock to come out with your fee?

DR. FULCHER: We would correlate this somewhat with the price the difference involves, so that you would have some places for variation over a period of time.

MR. YOUNG: You would be considering that into the package?

DR. FULCHER: We haven't talked about the formula.

MR. YOUNG: You don't care to go on into that at this time?

DR. FULCHER: We get into all kinds of little details. First, we will get the information and see where we are, then we can discuss formulas, although this paper has proposed some type of formula.

MR. YOUNG: Doctor, this is a public document, is it not?

DR. FULCHER: Yes, it is. You can all order this. It's from the University of Utah, and it's called "Aggi - Culture 65-3." We have found one real serious error -- like all these things you find errors after you get them printed -- but it's a real good document, a real good value, except on that one topic where they made a mistake, so we will just forget that!

MR. YOUNG: Will you see that Judge Hughes has hearings on these matters?

DR. FULCHER: I would not presume to tell Judge Hughes what to do. You tell him!

MR. ANDERSON: I think, Doctor, it would be safe to say that we have voted on that.

Also, I think I can safely say that our committee should be adjourned, so I will turn this meeting back to Judge Hughes right now.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Gentlemen, this is a very important question, as we all realize, that is facing us, and we have got to take a positive, as against a negative, approach on this question, and make every effort to get it behind us and I think the users of the range want it behind them, and to get something done.

I wondered this as I listened. Why can't we use, without any exorbitant fees, for instance, Colorado State College, an agricultural college? They do this type of work.

The same thing would be true with the University of Wyoming. I throw this out as a suggestion, that members in several States try and get their colleges to at least put out men that will gather this data. I think this data could be used. I have that in mind and let's follow it up.

Now, as far as I can judge, this will end the discussion until we have our executive session when we want to go into it again and come to some final understanding, if possible, whether we go along, how far we go along, what we want to do to help and assist in this.

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

DEALING IN FUTURES

Opening statement of the Honorable Fred S. Farr, California State Senate, moderating a panel presentation and discussion of the demands a rapidly expanding population place on the unexpandable land resource, before the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 28, 1966.

Secretary Anderson, it is really a privilege to be here. Our legislature is in session this afternoon, but I am playing hooky because I knew you were going to be down here. It's always good to see you; you have been a good friend of the California Legislature and we are proud that you are the Assistant Secretary.

The panel this afternoon is concerned with the future of the public lands, and in thinking about land, we have to think about people.

As you may know, about half the acreage of California is federally managed. Twenty percent of the State's area is in national forest land; 17 percent is in the supervision of the Bureau of Land Magagement; and more than half of the State's commercial forests are under either the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management.

I was advised at lunch time today that in the metropolitan Los Angeles area, considering in that area San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, there are 7 million acres of the public domain in San Bernardino County, and in Riverside County 1,400,000 acres, and the balance of that 9 million acres is down in San Diego County. Here is a tremendous amount of land that must be classified for retention, for management, or for disposal.

Four percent of the State's area is in national parks. Two percent of the land is used by the Department of Defense. The Department of Agriculture is the next largest landowner in California. Thirty-six percent of the State's land area is in the hands of private farm owners; 8 percent is privately owned commercial forests.

Three percent of the total land area is used by the State including, but not limited to, State-owned beaches, parks, highways, rights-of-way and State forests; four percent of the land is owned by private individuals or corporations including residential and industrial lands, and this four percent includes the land that is owned by municipalities including airports.

Now, when we think of this land we have to think of it in relation to our population. California's 18 million people is larger than the population of about 100 of the world's nations, and 158 thousand square miles of area is larger than that of 75 nations.

This afternoon we have a very distinguished panel here to talk to you about "Dealing in Futures."

This panel will be concerned with the problems of the future of this land.

Before we start, I would like to call your attention to the fact that the Senate Natural Resources Committee last year made a study of all the public lands of California. In the back of the room you will see this published "Land Ownership and Use in California." It is broken down by cities; it is broken down by counties; and it reveals a number of very interesting things. People talk about the public land; they think about the ownership by the Federal government and then, in a city like Los Angeles, they think about all the power and light, and they look at all the land that is up in Inyo and Mono Counties.

We found in this study that the city of San Francisco is a landowner in first place and Long Island, New York, follows second.

We also found that the city of Los Angeles has more land in streets and highways than the entire land area of the city and county of San Francisco.

This report is available. There are three or four copies there. If others of you want it, please get in touch with the Senate Natural Resources Committee in Sacramento and we will make it available to you. If you are interested in public land, I think you will find this to be the best inventory yet made on the subject of public land ownership in California.

INDUSTRY AND THE FUTURE

Initial statement of Harold R. Hochmuth, Director, Properties Management and Development, Douglas Aircraft Company, Inc., in panel presentation before the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 28, 1966.

When I accepted this assignment I noticed that I was the last one on the panel. Someone shifted gears on me today, so we will start out with this.

I am up before the National Advisory Board Council in a strange capacity from that over many, many years in the past so -- I do promise one thing, I will have nothing to say about grazing fees! I do think I could speak better on that subject.

What does industry look for in facility location? I'll probably speak more about the industry which I think I know better than some others, and that is the aerospace industry.

But, for an industry to grow, it must have space and many of the mistakes that the industry has made in the past, it has not planned for its growth, it has not planned for space for its growth. The way the industry developed in California, no one could have known how the society in southern California could so crowd in on industry that it had no further room to grow as far as space was concerned.

But now, it seems that this is a prize requisite in growth for certain types of industry; that is, it must have space to grow. In doing that, it is looking for stability, and in looking for stability it is looking at the general plan of counties for development; it is looking for some sort of stability so that it has some way to plan for the future.

It is looking for communities that wish industry in the community. Now, with all the attendant problems that it brings -- particularly in rural areas -- all the attendant problems than an industrial development brings to a small community, it's looking for resources, particularly resources peculiar to that industry; resource of land; natural resources; power; resources of transportation; resources of labor.

If those are some of the requirements, I would have to question then, what does the public land offer for industrial development. It offers one thing that I think a developing industry needs and that's space,

room to grow. Although this is not a primary consideration, it does offer land that is valued by the acre and not by the square foot. I have spent many years in the Bureau of Land Management, I suppose, selling land by the acre but I have not spent nine months in California buying land by the square foot, and it does make a difference.

But, this is a plus for public land, and just the plain availability of land, that is, the land is there -- of course, you have got to get BLM to sell it to you.

I think one of the problems in the sale of public land and the development of public land for industry is a problem I was aware of when I was with the government, and that is the determination that industry may be likely to speculate in public land -- and this is a likelihood -- but the determination, based on some classification requirement, that this project, or this company, or this industry needs a certain set acreage of land, and this ties back to my prior statement that I think it ought to be looked at in terms of growth. If you squeeze it too hard, you won't get your growth there and so, therefore, industry goes someplace else.

Now corporations are in the real estate business, or in the land business. They are in it for a hedge, and I am aware that corporations may go out and seek four or five alternate sites for the location of a facility, knowing that they are only going to settle on one site, but they will acquire four or five sites as a hedge in case of a forecast of the need. In case one site doesn't develop, you will find that they have hedges on four or five locations. Some of you call this speculation but -- I presume that I must have done it myself, but -- my company doesn't practice speculation of land. We just depreciate the value of the land.

Another problem, and I don't know the solution to it, one of industry's relationships to government, or the purchase of government property, is the competitive process. I know that the only safeguard to the public interest in the sale of government property is the competitive process of bidding for the property. This creates some problems in industry. I haven't come up against the competitive process bidding because we have been fortunate enough to be able to negotiate, or we are in the process of negotiating for government property. That is an aside -- and I know this is all being recorded -- but I think perhaps it would be better to competitive bid for government property than it would be to face the government operations on a negotiated sale. It's probably much easier.

But there is a problem of competitive bidding versus negotiated purchase of government property. I don't know the answer, but competitive itself sometimes does scare off industry.

I might make a countersuggestion as far as lands are concerned, and that is, it would appear to me that to attract industry to public land areas, the best way of doing it would be the formation of industrial parks by the counties and local communities where they purchase the land from the United States and then zone it and portion it out and then the land will attract industry for different purposes, including the tax base alone.

The industrial park idea is developing very rapidly. What is developing now, I think the Western States are going to fall very far behind the southeastern States if the industrial park idea isn't developed in greater depth in the Western States. There is a great deal of movement of industry to the southeastern States based on the counties developing industrial parks.

One other thing that concerns industry on the development of any land is the planning process in the local government. If there is not a planning process -- I don't know whether the Planning Directors of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties are here now, but I enjoyed hearing Mr. Pfulb speak on the general plans for San Bernardino County. We would look at those plans; we would look at the validity of them and look at the stability of them.

Well, before industry wishes to make a multimillion dollar investment in an area, it must have stability of land management. In a sense, we don't say that the planning process is fixed at a point in time, but there must be some direction the county is going if there are plans for the development of the land. If there is none, it probably is best to stay out of it.

There are certain areas where the supply of land, space is so rapidly running out that I could foresee -- well, it's already happening -- the movement of certain industry to the desert, to areas of wide open spaces. One of the problems in that movement, I think it probably more affects the aerospace industries because of the peculiarity of the industry, where space is such a necessity and I perhaps told some of my cohorts about the old problems that we have with the Bureau of Land Management. Douglas has a 320 acre test site on a Special Land Use Permit south of Edwards Air Force Base a short distance. I think it is the only piece of public land in the vicinity. We have some investment in it but I don't think we can stay there very long, and we hesitate to make more

capital improvements on it because there is no protection at all. There is no protection by a buffer around it; there is no protection from the Mining Law; no protection from the BLM, and I think Hall McClain raised our rental on that a couple of years ago, or a couple of months ago, and I protested that it was too high already.

My point is, the supply of land -- and I suppose this will be told by everyone on this panel -- the supply of land is rapidly running out so far as all the uses are concerned. There's a certain amount of multiple use that can be accomplished on it but for industrial purposes it becomes a single use of the land and all I could ask is that if industry moved to some of these rural areas, why, make the land available for them, sell it to them at fair market value but not a dollar more than that, and surround it by parks which are supported by the taxpayers and which give us a buffer zone. That way I'm sure that we won't have to look for additional space on the moon, although that is a possibility. Right now the deserts of California might serve very well.

RECREATION AND THE FUTURE

Initial statement of Michael J. Mc Closkey, Assistant to the President, Sierra Club, California in panel presentation before the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 28, 1966.

Our organization is principally noted for a particular type of recreation. It might be classified as a stylized and strenuous form, but today I hope to deal with some broad principles of recreational planning that may be applied to Bureau of Land Management's properties.

It is common today to make astronomical predictions of the increase in the demands for outdoor recreation. These estimates range from the three-fold increase by the year 2000 that the Outdoor Recreation Review Commission came up with two years ago to predictions ranging as high as a forty-five-fold increase that other planners have come up with.

This increase is, I think, particularly important as it applies to Bureau of Land Management lands in the Southwestern United States for two reasons in particular: One, these lands offer important opportunities for climatic relief. During winters and springs those who want to escape severe winter weather of the Midwest or East may increasingly look for these lands. And Two, the proximity of these lands to the growing urban clusters of Southern California, providing an opportunity for them to seek environmental contrasts, to seek escape from the pervasive urban landscape, to seek open space and uncrowded conditions.

Indeed, here we have about 10 million acres of BLM land in these counties juxtaposed to 10 million, or more, at the edge of them. The ratio is obvious and rather potentiatious.

But, I think in dealing with these close figures of how many millions of people we have and what the increases are projected to be, we have to go beyond them and look toward the mix of recreation forms that are involved and what they require and what their character is.

In many respects recreation has become a market. I think it is important for Resource Managers who are oriented, or have been largely

oriented toward producers' goods, such as forage for livestock, to realize that really a certain shift in perception is needed when you are dealing with recreation, and that this is a consumer service. You are dealing with the ultimate, final consumer. You have to present him with a finished project. The psychology of his reactions is one of the key things you are dealing with.

The production curve too, is practically instantaneous. You don't have a long time to gradually experiment with your approach to your productive process. He arrives at the site; it is there; he wants to use it; it either satisfies him or it doesn't.

The market is an extremely complex one. You have some forms of recreation that are relatively faddish that respond to commercial enterprises, promotions; boating and water-skiing have some of these elements for instance. These types of recreations are promoted by advertising and you may respect the market it is creating. When an agency caters to such a form of recreation, it has to ask itself whether it's merely satisfying its demands or participating in the creation of that market.

For instance, much of the establishment of reservoirs by the Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers' projects has created a market. The more those sources are provided, it extenuates the market further. In many respects it is not satisfying the demand at all. It is creating a demand.

Some forms of recreation, because they are faddish, will tend to shift. They have a very limited life potential. All you have to shift is your clientele. It's important to redo effective market analysis and so this gets into what's called "The Sociology of Play." Outdoor recreation is a form of play.

One researcher has suggested that in outdoor recreation we have a whole series of types of play forms. It's called "Symbolic Labor." It involves such things as cutting firewood and fishing and hunting, where a person enjoys doing something that used to be necessary in earlier society as part of work.

"Expressive play" is another label that they have come up with to describe such things as water-skiing, mountain climbing, exciting semi-hazardous sports.

"Subsistence play" is another if the wife engages in the campground in making dinner and keeping house, supposedly, in an outdoor environment.

Another is "unstructured play," such as waiting or watching the water or just gazing about. "Structured play" is another, patterned games of complicated rules, codes of conduct and restraint. And, sociobility is another source of satisfaction, this meeting of the people and being in contact with them.

There is a whole scheme of ideas about varying kinds of camps to satisfy various kinds or interests of recreation as it is developing, having central camps for people who are primarily interested in socialbility, getting together in an area that may afford climatic relief, an area that is even cooler in the summer or warmer in winter, who are not particularly interested in their environment though.

The key to proper recreation planning is to look closely to what is motivating the recreationalist when he comes here. One study has suggested that the study should be done in this manner: "Studies should examine the ways in which different recreation societies perceive and use physical space so that the design of recreation facilities may be sensitively adapted to the peculiar requirements of special societies."

Now, the various steps in planning for recreation have to be, I think, kept carefully in mind. The BLM has already started some of these steps. Obviously, the first one is a physical inventory of the suitability of their lands for various types of recreational forms, whereas the important geological societies shall study erodible beaches; the mountain areas that offer challenge to mountain climbers; where there are particular plants that appeal to those interested in nature studies, and where there are certain types of wildlife that are of interest to recreationalists.

Once this physical inventory is done, a second and more demanding task occurs, and that is re-determining what the recreational carrying capacity is for a site. There are two aspects to this carrying capacity idea from the field of range management.

One of them is the physical limitations of the site; how many people, especially in an intensively developed site, how many people can you have trampling in there before you are ruining the cover or what stage of so much limitation each year, especially weekend trade, does it start deteriorating; at what time of the year does your use come.

But then, even more difficult to determine than this is the second aspect of carrying capacity, and that is in terms of satisfaction to the user. For instance, wilderness areas. How many people can use a wilderness area before it begins to seem crowded and no longer affords that sense of isolation and discovery which is much of the essence of wilderness use. What is the wilderness carrying capacity? Certainly there is a far lower threshold there than at the opposite end of it which would be some kind of a central campground where people are seeking socialbility.

Once these carrying capacity-type studies are done, then you get into the broad question of zoning the various types of recreational sites, intensively developed ones and extensively used ones. Here the two items have to be kept carefully in mind, the capacity of the site and the preferences of the users; what are they seeking.

The key to this type of finding, I think, on BLM lands particularly, is the planning of access. I am not going to get into the question of access across lands of various jurisdictions and ownership, but the question of how you plan the road systems. I might suggest, perhaps, a different approach, to plan backwards.

Look at your site and say, "What is its carrying capacity?" and look at the transportation system or access system as a filtering mechanism to make sure that only the number of people get there that are consistent with its carrying capacity, or telescope your road systems down so that you don't build the highway, a heavily developed highway, right up to the edge of the site -- where some type of wildflowers, for instance, would be trampled to death; not run heavy roads right up to the edges of your wilderness areas.

In fact, I think many of the relatively primitive roads which exist across public domain lands are not the maximum that should be built, and in constructing these roads and telescoping them into a system of progressively less developed roads, the recreational planner should keep in mind he is almost in effect in show business. He has to stage a production for the recreationalist.

Recreationalists want to feel that when they get there they have gotten to something worthwhile seeing. He should be given a sense of importance at arriving there, that that is not just a common roadside area which you have the feeling of when a big road comes right up to it. If you come across an arduous journey and you turn off on side roads that progressively are of a lower and lower

character, you get a sense of discovery, a sense of adventure develops, a sense of uniqueness occurs that you have found something important, that you are just not one of the millions that will pass that point, even though, undoubtedly, others will be there and have been there.

Finally, I would hope that the Bureau of Land Management will plan for a broad spectrum of recreational useage; keep in mind that they are providing a service; that this is not a design merely for the conveniences of administration. There is a tendency in recreational plans today to standardize recreational forms into a limited number of categories that are easy to handle, to make all camp grounds heavily developed ones with heavy roads and put out a lot of cheap garbage cans that are easy to service and easy to pick up; to paint things colors that are easy to see, to find, but are inharmonious with the natural character of the place.

This is the challenge of recreational planning today. It is to know who you are planning for, and to put in the effort to do it well.

Finally, I think the Bureau of Land Management should consider just what its role is in providing recreational services. It comes to this field as a newcomer, largely, in face of other established agencies such as the National Park Service, the Forest Service, to a certain extent the Corps of Engineers and the various state park agencies. How does it fit into the whole picture. I think this should all be considered carefully.

It also should look at its role in terms of the regional planning that these other agencies are doing and private agencies are going. I would suggest that the agency capitalize on the inherent qualities of the sites it has; that its planning, first of all, be directed toward preserving the long term character of those sites that cater particularly to the durable forms of recreation that are not faddish; that are not the creation of advertising artificial stimuli; that the block-type services which are easily transferrable to other sites such as racetracks and various types of highly developed, mechanized and motorized sensational forms of recreation. These come and they go and they leave a lot of wreckage and debris in their wake and sensitive sites such as much of the public domain lands can't stand that kind of useage.

I hope that if the Bureau does get into business that it will keep these things in mind. I think it will have a very important future if it does.

MINERALS AND THE FUTURE

Initial statement of Ian Campbell, State Geologist, Department of Conservation, State of California, in panel presentation before the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 28, 1966.

Once upon a time long, long ago, as most of us measure time -- relatively short as geologists measure time -- some of our anthropoid ancestors swinging up in the trees took a look at the ground and decided that perhaps life offered more opportunity on the ground than in the trees and they forsook their terrestrial existence and left their trees and they have been on the earth ever since.

Now, it has been offered a number of times that one of the first things they discovered was that by picking up a big rock they could bash in the head of their neighbor much more easily than they could by using their fist.

A long time after that -- and now I can give you a specific date as the result of some very interesting geoclinical and geological work that has been going on at the University of California -- 1,700,000 years ago, give or take a few hundred thousand, a still more distinguished ancestor of ours, whom they have named "Homo Atlas," learned how to treat stones and started using stones as instruments -- scrapers, mortar and pestle, converting flint to the arrowhead state, but that wasn't long in coming.

These people lived in what is now known as the Olatte Gorge in Tanzania, formerly Tanganyika, in the center of Africa. It's rather interesting to think that what we now call the "Dark Continent" was then, perhaps, the cradle of civilization.

The particular point I want to make here is that while we don't know details of the diet of Home Atlas, he was probably eating at least as many calories as most of us do today, but throughout that 1,700,000 years, we Homos have been putting increasing demands on our mineral industry from originally the simplest rocks to more and more minerals and to more and more different minerals.

This is a point that I particularly want to stress: That whereas we were content -- even a relatively few years ago -- with iron and copper and lead and zinc, and so on, today we need many more different minerals, and we need more of each of those minerals per capita. In other words, the production curve for minerals is a constantly

217-692 O-66—7

steepening curve upwards, and if you compare mineral consumption in most foreign countries, in particular in the underdeveloped countries, with what it is in the United States today and figure that those countries are trying awfully hard to develop, fairly rapidly, somewhere near the level as we are, the consumption of minerals just looks frightening as you look ahead.

Now, a hundred years ago I think 30 per cent of the population of California were either engaged directly, or pretty closely indirectly, in mining, and the other 70 per cent, just through osmosis through their friends, knew quite a bit about mining.

Today, only about 3 per cent are actually engaged in mining and the other 97 per cent, I would venture, knows very little about the mining industry. So, before I look into the future, and having started 1,700,000 years ago, I want to stop and give you a few of the facts of life about minerals in general as we know them today.

First of all, I would like to quote a very distinguished engineer, Dr. Robert King, who referred to mineral deposits as "Accidents of Geology." This is, perhaps a little bit more sophisticated way of saying that "Gold is where you find it."

But, let's take an illustration. Some of you, I am sure, have heard of the Hall Process of making aluminum. Here is the process that made aluminum possible in the modern world, one of the great technological feats in this country. If it weren't for that, perhaps even Douglas would still be building planes out of wood and canvas, and when you go on a recreation trip you would be handling heavy iron pots instead of aluminum frying pans, and you would need two hands to flip those flapjacks. Think what aluminum means to us today. Without the Hall Process this would not have happened.

The Hall Process has two key minerals in it. One of them is named cryolite, a mineral that you have probably never heard of because it is very rare. Cryolite has been found in only two or three places in the entire world. There were a few pounds of it in veins under the slopes of Pikes Peak, but they were gobbled up years ago by mineral collectors; a few more pounds, maybe some hundreds of pounds in the Southern Urals in Russia, and cryolite, if you please, occurred in hundreds of thousands of tons on the Southwest Coast of Greenland, back of a little place called Invigut. That deposit has made possible the aluminum industry of today. That's what we mean by speaking of a half-sense of reality, but let's come closer to home.

Take the mountain pass bauxite deposits right out here in the desert, the world's greatest concentration of rare earths, and, as we venture, some of you know from watching the news lately, there is a greatly expanding development there, but because -- why? Not because of the theory that that was originally mined but because of europium oxide which is now recognized as an essential ingredient if you want good color vision in your colored T. V. tubes. It improves the reds and helps the greens. Europium oxide wasn't thought of five years ago. This is an illustration of what I mean of why we need more and more new minerals all the time, different minerals as well as more of the same minerals. It again illustrates one of the "Accidents of Geology." That mountain pass deposit is going to be supplying the entire world with europium oxide because there isn't any more like that, to speak of, any place else.

Or, take a still more interesting development, perhaps just as close or closer to home, the geothermal developments in the southern end of the Imperial Valley at Blythe. This is another "Accident of Geology." There is no place else in the world that we know where there is so much hot water with such a content of valuable, both fertilizer minerals and metals. Why is it there? We are still struggling to get the answer.

So, when we speak of the "Accidents of Geology," they are accidents which we are still studying and trying not to prevent but to learn how they happened.

Now, let's take a look at some of the things that I see in the future trends of minerals. I emphasized the consumptive curve, and so long as the population continues, or even if population is stabilized, if we demand more and more of what we come to think of as the "conveniences of civilization," we are going to have to have more minerals per capita, and more different minerals.

I think the trend in mining is going to be from underground to open pit, simply to satisfy the tremendous tonnage demands. Now, those of you who regard mines and open pit mines as scars on the landscape are probably going to shudder, bit I think again you have got to face some of the facts of life and I, for one, see no reason why an open pit mine has to be regarded as a scar on the landscape. We have a contra-illustration in Northern California, the old hydraulic Malakoff Mine, one of the famous gold producers in the gold days and which is now a State Park. It is a scenic area because of the scars left by the hydraulic miners.

There is no reason why scenery and mining can't be combined, it seems to me, and this goes for open pit mining. If you have underground mining, of course, it has to be so arranged that very little of it appears on the surface, yet you can have pretty sizeable tonnages from underground mines, too.

To discover these great mines of the future, requires much and much more of the sophisticated approach. It requires geophysics and geochemistry and a whole panoply of techniques that the prospector and his burro never even thought of. This calls for heavy capital investment; it calls for large companies and large organizations, and, as a previous speaker indicated today, you have to see stability ahead. They aren't going to locate where they think their claim is going to be taken away or where the law or zoning or what not is going to force them out. This is another of the trends I see.

I think, too, that more and more we are going to be depending on bulk minerals. One illustration, California today. It used to be the "Gold State," our principle commodity in terms of tonnage. Our second, in terms of value, is sand and gravel. This is a bulk commodity, and it just is not very economic to ship it very far, so you want to have your mining as close to where the consuming points are as you can arrange it. This is another fact of life that some people don't like, but I think it properly must be faced.

Let me emphasize once more the fact that, while some things occur -- some, you notice, occur in many countries -- minerals are still "Accidents of Geology." We should hope for relatively free trade throughout the world in order to get the minerals we need and to provide the rest of the world with the minerals that we have and they don't have, but as long as we have to face the problems of war, we also have to keep ourselves as nearly self-sufficient as we can. This throws still another problem into the problem of the future supply of minerals.

And the final point, one that I am sure is known to many of you but it deserves emphasis and re-emphasis, is that the mineral resources, unlike most other resources, are not renewable. When a vein or a lode, or even a few quarries is mined, it's gone, and you have got to find some other source. Someday, -- and I think this is much farther in the future than we are looking at this conference -- maybe we will be mining the ocean for many contents that we are not mining for now; maybe we will be mining common rock for all its essential ingredients, but that day is a long, long way off. In the meantime we must depend on these "Accidents of Geology."

If we are not ready to face these facts and make provision for mining opportunities and recognize this steeply increasing curve of consumption, then let's just plan to go back to being anthropoids and move back into the trees. We have a clear choice and for some, maybe the trees would look better.

WILDLIFE AND THE FUTURE

Initial statement of Ben Glading, Chief, Game Management Branch, Department of Fish and Game, State of California, in panel presentation before the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 28, 1966.

Well, here I come swinging in from the trees, I guess!

The theme of the panel discussion, "Dealing in Futures," is very timely as far as my part is concerned. The Department of Fish and Game has just completed a comprehensive planning effort that deals with the future of all fish and wildlife throughout the State.

The need for such a plan is obvious to most of us here today. We are all aware that the human population growth in California since World War II has been enormous, and that this growth is expected to continue. Water development, industrialization, agricultural practices, highway construction, and countless other activities of man connected with the population increase are, in turn, changing the quantity and quality of the fish and wildlife habitat.

Land and water are the key elements of this habitat. Without them in suitable quantity and quality there will be no wildlife. Opportunities exist in many cases that enhance fish and wildlife with proposed land and water use changes, provided we know what the animals or fish need and plan in advance for meeting these needs. In most cases, this enhancement does not "just happen" -- it must be planned.

It is a basic assumption of the California Fish and Wildlife Plan that human need for, and human effect upon, fish and wildlife is an accepted part of the entire scope of life and progress in this State.

It is the function of this plan to present, for the understanding and use of the people of California the situations and conditions which face fish and wildlife resources in this State up to the year 1980, which is the target date of our plan. Then, based on the foreseeable needs of the people, this plan points out actions which must be taken to maintain or improve California's wildlife resources so these needs may be met.

It establishes a framework of programs and policies and actions for the guidance of all the various entities, public and private, whose activities involve or affect California's fish and wildlife resources. I might say that other people or agencies had to do these things, but we say we do do these things to help fish and wildlife.

The plan delineates eleven major problem areas concerned with the resources and with carrying out the plans. I would like to limit my discussion to two of these major factors since they directly involve the public domain and the Bureau of Land Management.

The first deals with land use practices and technology. Within this area there are three related activities that often adversely affect wildlife habitat: agricultural practices, livestock and range practices, and the forest industry.

Something on agriculture since it is basic. It is an unfortunate fact that modern land use practices, through their efficiency and single purpose, are often detrimental to fish and wildlife. There are exceptions, of course, such as farm and range ponds and irrigation in previously unwatered areas.

The broad factors that make things difficult for fish and wildlife are large areas of uniform crops, chemicals, high speed machines, and overall efficiency. Agricultural lands are no longer farms in this State but are more closely allied to factories.

The large modern farm produces little wildlife and provides no recreation. Changing this reduces the landowner's profits and it is not realistic to expect a wildlife recreation plan to be incorporated with the production plan unless there are offsetting advantages, and these offsetting advantages to a landowner are in the form of dollars, generally.

Now to talk about livestock and range as they pertain to the subject at hand.

Areas of concern in this field may be defined as first, the range type conversions. The development of effective herbicides has opened a whole new field of range management. It is now feasible to convert shrub lands to grassland and remove even the trees. This produces a grass range favorable for cattle, but it would reduce habitat values for wildlife. Such conversions today are mainly centered in the Great Basin Range Area and in the western Sierra foothill ranges, on both public and private lands.

Another area of concern is supplemental water and feeding. Water developments on range lands allow a better distribution of livestock on the range. This is a conservation measure, but it allows cattle to remain on the range for a longer period than would otherwise be possible. Unless carefully regulated, this can lead to over-use of the range.

Placing food supplements on the range likewise creates the same type of problem. Cattle may now be kept on a range throughout the summer, when formerly it was necessary to move them elsewhere. Where supplemental feeding is practiced on a range, the cover is often overused.

A third area of concern has to do with stocking rates. There is abundant evidence of past and present abuse of California ranges, by livestock alone or by a combination of livestock and big game, especially deer. Striking examples are found in the drier parts of this State. Fortunately, increased attention is being paid to proper stocking of ranges, particularly in lands under public ownership.

Solutions to all these range problems involve close cooperation and exchange of information among government agencies and private landowners. Basically, the key to providing for wildlife on privately owned range lands parallels that for agricultural lands. Unless the landowner, government or private, can see some public duty or substantial benefit, economic or otherwise, from the fish and wildlife on his land, he will not be prone to consider natural values in his overall management programs. He must be advised and guided on how he may benefit by maintaining wildlife habitat on his property.

The range situation differs from cropland areas in that livestock ranges are, to a far greater degree, in public ownership. Such agencies as the U. S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management recognize the problem of range use and have programs underway to adjust grazing pressures to correct abuses. Further effort is needed along the following lines, however.

First, the multiple use principle is recognized on public lands, but in actual practice commercial values tend to overshadow wildlife values. Range advisory boards, timber and other interests have succeeded in influencing administration of the lands to their own ends. There is nothing wrong with this but we are just pointing out what is happening.

What is lacking, and much needed, is public awareness of the problem and a strong and continual expression of public support of conservation principles, including fish and wildlife values. A better informed public would undoubtedly provide such expression, so informational and educational programs must be planned to meet this need.

Secondly, vegetation type conversion programs on both public and private lands are geared to commercial interests; for example, timber plantations and conversion of tree and shrub lands to grasslands. Recreation is not generally recognized as a full partner in such land use.

If fish and wildlife conservationists are to present a strong case they must be able to measure the effects of various land use practices on wildlife and propose alternative programs in line with a true multiple use concept. Research and investigation is needed, therefore, to provide not only methods of proper land use evaluation.

Something about forest practices. Timber harvest operations have played a large role in the past in increasing the numbers of both big game and small game animals. The original virgin forests of California were poorly populated with game. Opening of the woods allowed browse and herbaceous vegetation to develop and provided the needed cover and food for game animals. Recent and foreseeable forest practices may reverse this trend in some degree.

The ever increasing demand for forest products leads to more intensive forest management. The shrub areas are being cleared and converted to tree plantations. The ability of such plantations to support wildlife depends on the amount of shrubby ground cover that is allowed to grow under such a forest canopy.

The major habitat problem presented by the forest industry is its effect on fishing streams. This effect is seen in two main ways; first, siltation. Freshly logged areas are subject to erosion, which can silt the streams and careless private loggers are the chief offenders, but it must be admitted that private irresponsibility seems to be encouraged by the broad dispersion of governmental responsibility. Seven state agencies and six other agencies are concerned with erosion control in California.

Another forest practice that has an effect on wildlife is the accumulation of logging debris in stream beds and the disturbance of stream beds by road building, log skids and other logging practices result in the physical destruction of fish habitat.

It should be noted that timber practices on public forests are generally well planned, with consideration given to other uses of the forest. It is in the field of private forest management, as it relates to stream damage, that the greatest problem lies. Under present observed practices an estimated 1,000 to 3,000 miles of streams could be seriously affected by 1980 from pollution, littering of stream beds, road construction and siltation.

The second major problem area involves public access to the State's fish and wildlife resources. These resources cannot be used and enjoyed unless they can be reached. With an ever increasing human population settling in California, access problems are numerous now and they will get even more critical.

It is estimated that by 1980, which is not too far away, there will be 800,000 hunters compared to 650,000 hunters now; about 3,000,000 anglers compared to 1,700,000; and a major increase in other fish and wildlife-oriented outdoor recreationists. California will have almost twice as many fishing, hunting and wildlife recreationists as it has today, and this is only thirteen or fourteen years away.

Access problems are generally connected with fishing and hunting, but the access needs of those who choose to use binoculars or cameras instead of rod and gun in enjoying wildlife resources must also be considered.

About one-half of the State is publicly owned. Not all of this acreage, however, is accessible to the fisherman, hunter or other wildlife-oriented recreationist.

Some public lands, such as some military areas, are not available for use by the general public. Some, such as national and state parks, offer restricted types of public use. County firearms closures and legislative refuge districts restrict hunting on both public and private lands. Some public lands may be open to any public use, but the public cannot get to the lands because of surrounding private property or lack of access roads.

The overall problem of access is difficult and complex. Some of the access problems involving public lands are: First -- and this is first in order of importance as well as time -- and this is retention of public lands and waters in public ownership.

Involved in this problem, a problem of California, are over 14 million acres administered by the U. S. Bureau of Land Management. Under the Multiple Use Act, these lands are presently being classified as to proper use, including establishment of criteria as to which will be retained or disposed. Large acreages of these lands have significant value for wildlife and recreation.

California Department of Fish and Game has entered 84 requests to the Bureau of Land Management for over 6 million acres of public domain lands having significant wildlife values, requesting that these lands be retained in public ownership. We are working with the Bureau of Land Management to insure the continued public ownership of these lands and to have them classified as multiple use areas.

To date, 25 requests have been granted, totaling some 816,000 acres in what are known as National Cooperative Land and Wildlife Use Areas. We hope that the balance of the large important areas to wildlife will be similarly dedicated on one program or another.

Secondly is the problem of private lands blocking access to public lands and waters.

Surrounding private property often blocks access to public lands and waters. Some of the most urgent problems are in national forest and public domain. For instance, the 58,000 acre Caliente National Cooperative Land and Wildlife Management Area, one of the great areas that I just talked about in the 25, is largely blocked because the public can't get to it because of surrounding private land completely blocking access, and there are others, although not as major areas of California that I can cite.

Next, the big question of ocean frontage. Unfortunately, the State is not as wide as our neighbor to the north where this important natural resource, the ocean frontage is devoted to public ownership.

The next is river and flood plains. There are several hundred miles of major waterway where most of the lands and levees are in private ownership. This problem is critical in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Drainage.

Another major problem of access is that of existing land ownership patterns of both public and private lands that impair access, and I'm talking about the detail you would see if you looked at the yellow area of that map with a fine glass. There are little checkerboard areas, many so fine that you can't even depict them on a map of this sort.

There is an immediate need to consolidate ownership and control of public lands through land exchanges between public agencies themselves and between public agencies and private owners to reduce the checkerboard ownership pattern. This is an old song of mine and I talked to a BLM man at lunch and said that, "If you fellows did nothing in the next 25 years but consolidate your ownership, you would really be dealing in the future."

One example of this problem exists in lands controlled by the BLM and the State Lands Commission. The BLM's extensive holdings are interspersed with State school lands, Sections 16 and 36 in each township, under the jurisdiction of the State Lands Commission. Here are two

public bodies; presumably it should be easy for them to get together and say, "Equal value? We will just trade. We have some very important blocking now but it will help solve our problem," and we think that this problem is one that will have to be solved and it should be solved.

The State Lands Commission is disposing of these lands rapidly. When these lands go into private ownership, effective land management is hampered and key access routes will be blocked.

Then there comes a question of physical access and here I don't want to seem to disagree because I think we are basically in the same ball park as far as degree of access is concerned.

There are areas where road construction would allow the public to enjoy a relatively unused area.

However, there are few inaccessible areas left in California, and discretion must be exercised in developing access. Retaining some areas in their remoteness also has high value.

The Department of Fish and Game has constructed access roads, on its own or cooperatively with the Bureau of Land Management on the public domain, after analysis of access needs. Construction of access roads is considered at annual meetings with the BLM on a district basis.

This problem is not quite as pressing as those four. The present approach of consultation and cooperation with agencies concerned with access development will be continued. We say that the development of roads can come after the insurance that the land stays in the public ownership and this blocking out occurs and the public can get legal access to the land.

And finally, there is the question of public unfamiliarity with the location and boundaries of public lands. The public is unfamiliar with the location of public lands, and what's the reason for this? Certainly it's the checkerboard business. It's to the interest of some landowners to keep this a secret and to the interest of other landowners to show the public where they can recreate legally.

Forest Service boundaries are well posted and maps showing access roads, landmarks, and camping sites are generally available. Now, this is a general statement although it could be true in most cases.

This is not true of the vast and scattered lands of the Bureau of Land Management and the State Lands Commission. There is room for much improvement here.

The Department of Fish and Game has emphasized the need for adequate posting of the boundaries of these larger management areas. Posting is needed on the access roads in particular. The need for maps has been pointed out to the Bureau of Land Management to assist the public in locating these larger blocks, and it is encouraging to know that BLM is moving in this direction in a cooperative manner with us.

The BLM is posting these larger blocks of land having a degree of permanence. In particular, entrance and exit points should be delineated. Detailed maps should be available to show the public where these lands are and where the access points are located.

The Department of Fish and Game owns very little land. We are in a position to tell other people how to run theirs. Many of the future access problems can only be solved by private landowners and public land management agencies properly. The Department's role is to advise and aid and encourage them to plan for use of the fish and wildlife resources found on their land and waters.

LIVESTOCK AND THE FUTURE

Initial statement of Robert Reierson, Project Leader, Western Livestock Marketing Information Project, Denver, Colorado, in panel presentation before the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 28, 1966.

It is obvious that there are some differences of viewpoint here on this panel today, and there are a couple stories I would like to tell about this, in a sense of paralleling these differences, these points of view.

One of them is the three people who were standing on the edge of the Grand Canyon looking down into this great abyss, and one of them said, "Isn't this a wonderful creation of God?"

And the second one, who probably could have been our Dr. Campbell, said, "Isn't this a wonderful creation of nature?"

Well, the third one happened to be a cowboy and he said, "Wouldn't this be a hell of a place to lose a cow?"

The other one is expressed by the H. Reid cartoon of the old, rough cowboy and livestock operator who was working over his annual records and he calls out to his wife and he says, "Hey, Ma, I've got good news for you. We only lost half as much money as the year before." So that's success, too.

Many of you are from California and I did want to explain the project that I'm with. While I am located in Denver, I do work with Nelson Carpenter in California in this publication called "The Western Livestock Roundup." I hope that many of you people in California receive this through the Agricultural Extension Service of California. I plan on seeing Nelson Carpenter before I leave your State.

I am speaking today not as an expert in terms of how the public lands should be used or the legal aspects or the technical aspects of management, but hopefully as an expert in trying to make some informed guesses regarding the longrun developments in the cattle and sheep industry of the United States, and of the West.

In doing this, I prefer to look at what you might call "The extensive utilizations of roughages" for cattle, calf operations, sheep operations. I really don't think that it's appropriate or needed here to make any extensive comments certainly on the cattle feeding industry, for example, including changes that may take place in that, but further, and primarily, roughage utilization.

First, we have to make a few assumptions and the basic one, the first one, is: What kind of beef consumption will be demanded by our population? In this, I have to start off speaking of the country as a whole, because the beef from some of these animals that starts from these eleven Western States certainly ends up on the dinner table all over the country.

Now, there are some who say that we can exist on vegetables and a synthetic diet, and it may very well be that this will happen sometime. I think it's pretty hard to tell when this will come about, when the kinds of population pressures will exist so that this will be necessary. But certainly, there's every indication in the foreseeable future that consumers of this country really are going to continue to demand beef and perhaps increasing amounts of it, and they are going to back up these demands with dollars for quite a few years to come.

I just want to say that while I am on a project that is cooperative between the education services of the West and the U.S.D.A., I certainly am not a spokesman for the U.S.D.A. here today, but I do intend to use some of their research results related to this.

The Department of Agriculture has projected various crop and livestock productions, also for consumption of various items, they have projected likely trends to 1980. These indicate an increase of 70 to 75 per cent of total beef consumption. The write-ups on this say that "We can expect a likely trend away from lower-cost starchy foods for, more possibly, high protein and processed foods."

Continuing, "A strong demand for beef and veal is expected to expand further, leading to increases in per capita consumption, possibly to around 117 pounds per person by 1980." For beef, this would be 40 to 50 per cent above the 1964 level in terms of overall beef production, but also projecting a decline in pork consumption.

I might just say that this figure of 117 pounds by 1980 could compare with the figure in 1965 of 104 pounds for beef and veal, and I think in 1966 we will probably drop back three or four pounds below that. We always have to be a little careful in using these figures because we are either talking of beef or combined beef and veal. Veal is running about four pounds so in 1965 and 1964 we have consumed 99 to 100 pounds per person as against 1966 when we will drop back to about 95.

For how these figures convert in terms of cattle slaughter and cow numbers -- and then later I would like to use some slides here in terms of the different states, in regions of this country -- on these projections for 1980, they would call for total beef and veal production of 27 billion pounds, or 43 per cent increase over 1965. This is using a U. S. population figure of 245 million people compared with a little under 200 million people now.

In terms of cattle slaughter versus calf slaughter, I took this projection of overall beef consumption and demand and broke it down then to say what kinds of cattle and calf slaughter and what kinds of cow numbers would this call for.

Cattle and calf slaughter dropped off from almost 8 million head in 1965 to 5 million head due primarily to the continued decline of dairy cow numbers and probably to a smaller proportion of calves and dairy cows going to slaughter as calves.

Allowable average weights increased at about the same increasing rate that they have increased for 20 years. Another factor that enters into it in the sense that one of these assumptions that we make is that at the present time fed cattle account for about 55 to 58 per cent of the total cattle slaughtered in this country. This can increase. I would project an increase in the number of fed cattle by 1975 or '80 to account for about 70 per cent of total cattle slaughtered, and this is one of the places we do get heavier weights and an advantage in terms of beef production per cow.

Dividing this out, the average weights into a total beef figure, we would come out with a cattle slaughter of about 45 million head. Now, this is an increase of about 22 per cent from 1965; in other words, a fairly modest increase in overall cattle slaughter in relation to the increase in beef production that we would expect, and then crank this back into the cow numbers that this would require considering the slaughter, the death loss and then some continued increase in overall inventories. This would say that we need about 16.5 million cows by 1980. This compares with just under 15 million cows on January 1 of this year.

This kind of an increase in cow numbers is faster than we have had in the past, and again, it makes a difference whether we are talking total cows or beef cows, but in this illustration we are talking about total cows.

We have been picking up, in the past 20 years, since World War II particularly, on the beef side, by a decrease in dairy cows and in some, many cases at least, beef cows coming in to replace these dairy cows.

Well, with this kind of a background, I would like to quote John Hopkins of the Bank of America here in California when he said, "Increasing numbers of calves will be needed by the mid-1970's and these cannot be supplied from existing grass areas under present technology and present levels of management."

Again, I would like to come back and say that what I think, that roughage is going to become the critical resource in what we are talking about here in terms of cow numbers.

Just as an example of this, through the Corn Belt there have been increases in cow numbers and beef cow numbers over a period of years. This is because historically in the Corn Belt there have been some roughage resources that have not been fully used. I was in Chicago last week at a State Extension Meeting for Agricultural Industries and the farm management fellow there was pointing out that they are tearing out a lot of fence lines; expanding farms pretty fast; going rapidly from crop-livestock companies and enterprises to strictly cash-crop operations, and they are going away from the roughage and they are eliminating frequently some of the roughage resources.

There are some who say that we will not get back, ever, to the per capita consumption levels we had in 1964 and 1965. I don't agree with this. I think that we will get back up above 100 pounds per person in about another four or five years and I think that it is reasonable to project increases in per capita consumption to 115 to 120 pounds by 1980.

The per capita figures here that were used are an increase of only about half as fast as the period since 1947, and again let me point out that the major assumptions that we made in this -- the assumption that per capita beef consumption; the assumption on continued population increase of between 1.2 and 1.5 per cent a year; the continued decrease in dairy cow numbers; an increase in the proportion of cattle going to the feed lots.

I will finish up in about five minutes. I did want to use these charts, which I am afraid you can't all see, but with this table setup I just can't get any farther away than we already are here.

But, I wanted to use two in terms of first showing the calf crop by states, and what is the relative importance of different areas of the country?

Here we have the eleven Western States where the beef cattle crop in 1965 was a little over 6 million head, 23 per cent of the U. S. total, and, of course, you can see the variation of the states in the West.

Then, we frequently like to add in the so-called "Four Northern Plain States," and we pick up another approximately 20 per cent of the U. S. total.

Then, the important States of Texas and Oklahoma, even though we have all those stories about Texas, and so forth, we like to kid them a little, but Texas is awfully important in cattle production in this country, again about 21 per cent of the U. S. total; the Corn Belt, 15 per cent of the U. S. total beef cattle.

You see essentially what we are showing here also is beef cows because this is the way we arrive at the figures, by multiplying the percentage of the calf crop for each state by the number of beef cows in that state, but the Corn Belt, anyway, is 15 per cent.

And then the Southeastern States, in which is another 18 per cent of the U. S. total.

Now, the other chart I wanted to use really shows the increase in the beef calf crop over a 20-year period, and a look at where these increases have come.

We take a look at these eleven Western States and in that period the beef calf crop has increased 2.5 million head in this area. In those four Plains States again it has increased about 4 million head; in Texas and Oklahoma, it has increased 2.5 million head; the Corn Belt has increased a little under 2.5 million head, so we have had a sizeable increase in the Corn Belt as well.

And then, these Southeastern States have increased a little over 3 million head.

The point I wanted to make here is that we often hear or cite figures of the great percentage increases in the Southeastern States, and this is true. This is where some of the most rapid increases have come percentage wise, but numerically the biggest increases have come essentially from the five Plains States, from Texas to South Dakota.

217-692 O-66—8

Then, it seems to me that we might take a look at the future in terms of the various regions and raise this question: Where are the increases apt to come in coming years?

Again, looking at this framework that we are talking about, it would appear that we are going to need an increase of about 20 to 25 per cent in terms of cows in the next fifteen years. I used to say that we would get some pretty general increases throughout the U. S., maybe not quite as fast in the West because of your limitations of moisture, but then these Corn Belt boys bring up this question and they don't think that we are going to get much or any increase in beef cow numbers in the Corn Belt over a long run future; that cows, beef cows, will not be able to compete either with hogs or particularly with crops.

And then, you know, there is the other thing: it's become that Illinois is an export state and an import port, almost, as far as corn is concerned. This corn flows to the Mississippi River and down the Mississippi into our export market, and the corn is pretty available to the export market. In fact, that is probably where the bulk of it is grown, up through the headwaters of the Mississippi River, and also, most of the corn goes out of Illinois down to some of the brother areas of the Southeast. So, in a sense, this may not be the kind of a roughage area and the increase in beef cows that we see in the future, but certainly, there will be increases throughout the South and Southeast.

On the other hand, it would seem to me that we are likely to have some increases in forage production in the West as well, in terms of improved land management, improved carrying capacity over a period of time, so I think that we will see some further increases in the West.

In the sense that some of the other panel members were talking, I thought we were talking about two different worlds. Harold Hochmuth was talking about the demands of industry because this is one of the areas in which there are people, in industry, and yet some of these wide open spaces in the West have this resource of grass that may be of increasing importance.

And then, of course, there is the question of over a period of time, where will we turn in terms of our food supplies and the source of our feeds and foods for human use?

I would like to make just a couple of brief comments about sheep and lambs and the wool industry. We have been decreasing the sheep numbers generally since World War II. It looks like this decrease has now leveled off. There was practically no change in sheep-lamb numbers during 1965, and I guess it will be that we will see some small increase in sheep numbers over the coming year, but probably not any large changes.

As you know, the American Sheep Producers Council and many other groups have been working on trying to increase the demand for these products. It is hard to measure the results of such efforts, but in any case it looks like there's absolutely a leveling off of that part of the livestock industry.

I would like to make just one closing comment in terms of whether this is 20 years or 30 or 50 or 75, I am not sure, but let me make a couple comments as far as the next two or three years with the cattle industry particularly.

As I indicated, I think we are going to drop to about 95 pounds per person on meat consumption this year; we are going to start a holding back of cows and heifers either this year or next year -- I think we have already started it -- and there is going to be a pretty tight beef supply this summer and fall in this country.

And then, as we swing around into built-up numbers, our beef supply is apt to stay on the low side during 1967 and possibly 1968. Before we get back up to a level of numbers that we started building up this beef supply, and I say that this is going to be along about 1970 or so, we are going to be back to more than 100 pounds per person in beef consumption again.

PEOPLE AND THE FUTURE

Initial statement of Larry Freeman, Past President, California Newspaper Publishers Association, in panel presentation before the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 28, 1966.

I am sure you all heard about the speaker who apologized for his wife's not being able to come with him. He took out a poster and spread it out, and it said "K.I.S.S." He said, "It doesn't mean what you think. It means, 'Keep it Short, Stupid!'" And that is what I am going to try to do.

It would appear to me that the topic which I have been given, "People and the Future," is so broad as to be all-inclusive. With the possible exception of wildlife -- there might be some questions over this in view of the signs that seem to be popping up over much of California -- that people in general are inevitably linked with all phases that have been discussed, and will be by the other eminent panelists in this group.

Perhaps the easiest and best way to approach the question would be to refer to "Westward Tilt," a very colorful and comprehensive account of today's West by Neil Morgan who happens to be with the "San Diego Evening Tribune." He was to occupy this niche originally, so I am a late comer.

"The land is full of people, from Melvin Belli to hearty waitresses, and it covers all the Western States," but, inasmuch as it runs for 300 or 400 pages, I will not be able to read it to you or even give you a digest. However, if you will pardon the plug, for some of those of you who are interested in people, it concerns some of the facts, trends and revolutions brought about by a population trend to the West, notably California.

It is the goal of Mr. Morgan and many others to attempt to preserve a West that will be charming and attractive despite what yet appears to be an unending hoard of migrants. What we would all like to see is attractive, well-planned cities; their commerce flourishing their citizens all bright-eyed, happy and spaciously housed; broad streets; uncluttered freeways with few, if any signs to mar the landscape; bountiful parks, both inside our cities and in the back county; richly stocked lakes and streams; long and meandering hiking and riding trails; rolling fruit farms placed so that no one objects and from which the food producers can make a living, pay his taxes and resist the pressure from developers.

And, of course, ample water; plenty of pure air; and finally, shopping centers that don't look like shopping centers.

In view of the still apparently losing battle to accomplish even a portion of the goals, we seem to be in need of a benevolent despot. The problem is so gigantic that this might develop into the only thorough answer; however, since none of us, even the extremists, yet claim that our own particular leader be construed as a completely altruistic czar, we are going to have to depend upon ourselves, our bureaus and our departments to utilize the West's potential to its highest degree.

It is probably an old figure to most of you but according to the University of California Agricultural Service, for each increase of ten people in the State, one acre of good farmland is converted to nonagricultural use. If the average annual rate of conversion in recent years continues, 900 thousand acres of cultivable land will have been converted to nonagricultural uses in a fifteen-year period between 1961 and 1975. So, simple arithmetic is appropriate at this point.

California's total acreage is 100 million plus. There are about 16 million acres suitable for cultivation. Of the 100 million acres, 50 million is Federally controlled. The Forest Service controls nearly 20 million; the Department of Defense,8 million; and the Department of the Interior, more than 21 million, including 16 million under the Bureau of Land Management.

Now, as the waves of migrants come into the State, not only do they gobble up much of the State's prime land -- and I suspect this will be true in much of the West in projections of the near future -- but various agencies, such as the division of highways, schools, and the like, are taking further use of the best land. They also amass some contradictions and rather tragic ironies.

Some of the newcomers -- probably those from the rural areas of the Middle West and the East -- have a tendency to move into the surburban and rural areas of California. When they find themselves alongside dairies or egg ranches, it is not long before the demand is served that these providers of food take to the hills and leave the new residents in peace, without the flies and with a pleasant aroma.

While it is true some of these new residents, usually those with means, choose hillside and rugged homesites, the vast multitude finds the eager subdivider ready and willing to provide tract homes, smack in the middle of fertile plains and valleys.

There is an irony here in that some of the hillside mansions have been known to slide off, recently -- as the result of heavy rains which in turn flood tract homes in the valleys. However, by and large, if our men of destiny could find a means of shifting homesites for migrants out to the less desirable land areas instead of bulldozing everything to a single-level site, we would be on our way to a better world.

When Zeckendorff -- he's a New York developer who lives in southern California -- a few years ago he expressed amazement that instead of sprawling subdivisions we have not erected so-called "high-rise dwelling units," and let the beautiful land around such a tower be used for recreation. While there is some bonafide objection to high-rise that will mar coastal views, he seems to have a point as far as the interior goes.

As you may have guessed, it has been my lot to participate in a small way in San Diego County's efforts to save fine lands. It is no secret, either, that heavy and increasing assessed valuation of farmlands, there and elsewhere, is also contributing to their demise. Sale of these lands becomes almost an economical necessity for the owner to survive and, of course, the speculators standing in the wings ready to glom on to these prized areas and to hold them for higher prices.

It is my understanding that the Bureau of Land Management has begun to sell or to divest itself of the few bits and pieces of public lands through private use and development. It would appear to me that if the people are to keep any of this State -- and I think the West could be included -- heritage of charm and beauty, or to inherit anything but more people and more houses on fertile lands, the above-mentioned trend may be at least humble. It may even be stimulation and pressure.

Already some California growers are moved to establish farm operations in Mexico. The importation of foods from our neighbor to the South is increasing at a fantastic rate. It goes all over the country, especially all up and down the coast. Maybe this is not bad; maybe it is inevitable. Nevertheless to a nonexpert it would still appear to be much more desirable, and economically sounder, if the peoples' food supply could be grown in its own State, California in this case.

He would still hope, this nonexpert, that some way or another, through use of the complex new California Land Conservation Act of 1965, and some Federal and/or State pressure, to shift the housing off of prime land on to less desirable growing land and that a better State might be saved for the people.

Parenthetically, for those not familiar with it, the Land Conservation Act is designed to allow a prime landowner to keep it in agricultural use by application of a break on assessed valuation through contracts with County Boards of Supervisors.

Again, I may seem to have to dwell on farm aspects but this is only because I am most familiar with this.

I am sure that in a general sense lands for wildlife and recreation, if not civic, minerals, and industry, need to be saved for the same reason than using somewhat kindred methods. Certainly a State of nothing but people could not be construed as being an attractive habitat.

While it is true that there is still some frontier, it is disappearing with relative rapidity. It behooves us, the public, through legislative and private channels to save it for ourselves and our children and our childrens' children. As Neil Morgan points out, "We are maturing in the West. We have the leaders, business and industrial; giants of science. Instead of a marriage of science and industry, about which we hear so much, we actually need a marriage of these leaders in planning and/or zoning. Instead of emphasis on physics, missiles and outer space, perhaps we need to turn to the problems of inner space, so to speak."

It must be obvious that the key to keeping California attractive -- and the West, I think, again -- for people is in planning. It is my understanding that in San Diego County a step is being taken in this direction. Although it has not been given final approval, I understand that it will be.

Under this project the county will have prepared soil maps throughout the county which will be used and considered in the preparation of a general plan for the county. This would lead one to hope that some land would be saved for its best possible uses including farming, recreation, wildlife, cities and so on.

As a postscript, minorities, of which we hear plenty, seem to get what they want, at least to some degree, and, in many instances, the problem lies in the unorganized majority -- which applies to some of us but not to most of us -- needs to exert its potential power to keep the West attractive and livable. We need to organize our articulate majority which can rally us to exert pressures so that the West can give us the way of life that most of us want.

CITIES AND THE FUTURE

Initial statement of Samuel E. Wood, Executive Director, California Tomorrow, in panel presentation before the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 28, 1966.

Before I get into my formal remarks, I want to underline some of the things that Larry Freeman touched upon.

I think I understand now the real difficulty that the Bureau of Land Management faces while trying to go through this metamorphosis from relatively single-purpose to multipurpose management. I was struck today by the presentations that were made here, most of them single-purpose interests involving Uncle Sam's lands. That's our lands, and this is true from even people who might have thought the relatively general approach to recreation and recreational demands is still, in a sense, a sort of single-purpose approach.

And, of course, when you begin to justify open pit mining on the basis of whether or not you are going to go back to the trees, some of us would a lot rather go back to the trees.

Now, these single-purpose interests that are largely represented in this room, and who have been discussing the problems of the West from the standpoint of BLM, have their own economic status stated in their purpose as they are personally known. And, they have their own legislative committees and they have their own agencies in State and Federal government representing them at the level of policy.

I think that the problem you are trying to solve here in this program to bring these interests together requires somebody like Solomon -- and I don't know whether BLM is like Solomon or not, but we have to have, it seems to me, somebody, some agency, some place that's going to look at the sole public interest in these single-purpose and try through the multiplicity of uses somehow -- and single purpose may be on some of these lands -- to reach the solution on the use that is not going to ruin the land and the country.

I am supposed to talk about "Cities and the Future," and I am going to borrow or steal -- and I apologize a little bit when I do this -- I'm going to look back at what's happening and tell you how we got out of the trap that we are in now.

When historians look back from the perspective of our future cities -- if indeed we ever have cities of the future -- they will no doubt recognize that the problems of the 1960's appeared to be almost insurmountable. The southwest States of California, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, and Utah had experienced the greatest urban growth of any region in the United States -- nearly all of it around such developing metropolitan areas as Salt Lake City, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Phoenix and Albuquerque. In most cases, particularly at Phoenix, Albuquerque, and Los Angeles, urban growth was expanding outside incorporated cities on Class I and Class II lands.

The metropolitan Los Angeles area alone had experienced an increase greater than that of any State in the Union except for California itself. But all urban areas were feeling the pressure of rapid growth. They had grown too fast to grow wisely, and this sheer rate of growth advanced the cost of providing the physical plant to house people and furnish them jobs and recreation. And the physical plant, itself, was built largely without plan and without control.

Although most urban areas of the United States faced difficult problems of growth, those of the Pacific Southwest were so overwhelming in magnitude that it appeared that the area was on a collision course with catastrophy.

One of these overwhelming problems was the failure of all levels of government to cope with the needs for the transportation of people and goods. In most of the area, there were almost as many automobiles and trucks as there were people. The car was not only consuming a good share of the family budget -- often more than the house -- but it made possible strip cities, downtown congestion and the spread of the slurbs.

The problem faced then became not one of engineering but one of space for freeways and parking areas, and the sheer economics of taking this bulk of land out of production. About 60 percent of all land in the urban areas had been handed over lock, stock and barrel to the automobile.

A second problem that caused continued concern was the loss of open space through the unguided location and haphazard growth of urban areas. Dredged, drained, and filled shorelines on rivers, harbors and lakes eroded waterfront areas and destroyed major fishing and spawning beds and wildlife areas, while bulldozers leveled off the remaining hilltops and filled in the flood plains.

The open space provided by producing farms was also devoured by hasty and uncontrolled urban growth. As Albuquerque spread over the Class I and Class II lands, most of its beauty and much of its tourist industry disappeared. As California lost 150 thousand acres of prime agricultural land each year, it was threatened with the actual destruction of all high-value cropland by the year 2000. The retreat of farmers from developing metropolitan areas forced the cultivation of less fertile slopes and hillsides, raising the cost of goods and strangling the State's major industry.

Over 2 million acres of California land was scheduled to be consumed in the construction of the State's highway system, including over 1,000 acres of California's parks. The destruction of this park land would permit a total savings of about 12 miles out of the 12,400 miles of constructed freeway.

A third critical problem was the failure of government at all levels to establish the planning mechanisms and to pay the price necessary to control air and water pollution.

While it was recognized that pollution was related to physical characteristics -- to rivers and runoff, to topography and climate, and to atmospheric basins and inversion layers -- the people of the southwest continued to overload their water and atmosphere as they used both as sewers to carry away institutional and personal waste.

The blanket of coal smoke that used to hang over Salt Lake City had been replaced with the more poisonous auto-produced smog. Every metropolitan area in the southwest suffered from this type of pollution. There appeared to be no acceptable political solution to prevent damage from exceeding the danger point as the population doubled and the motor vehicles increased in proportion.

It was in the year 1966 that local, State, and Federal government, faced with the seemingly impossible effort to accommodate population growth to limited resources, began to take a cold look at what policies and nonpolicies and programs were doing to their land and landscape.

In the first place, an effort was made to reassess the relative authority and responsibility regarding local, State and national interest in land and landscape.

Local government insisted on the authority to control land uses yet failed to exercise this authority for the protection of the land. It is true that highway builders cut trees and gouged the land, but it was local leaders who handed them the axe and surrendered their jealously guarded responsibility for the landscape. When parks were sold for private purposes or invaded for other uses, it was local government that violated a public trust, as they did throughout the region. When private interests built our neon alleys and financed our slurbs, they did so with the blessings of our cities and counties.

In spite of urban renewal efforts underway in a number of cities, their core areas became more and more the living place for the rich, the poor, and the minority families. While the failure on the part of the cities thus permitted the deterioration of the downtown areas, the counties usually refused the responsibility for the developing circle of decay on the outside fringes.

With the recognition of these facts, it was also recognized that there are certain problems beyond the grasp of the power of cities and counties.

The limits of this grasp are determined by both physical and political factors.

First, major unsolved problems extended beyond the boundaries of existing local jurisdiction. The problem of highway and freeway location reached beyond the boundary of a city or of a county and, even at the regional level, could only be approached in a segmented fashion. In the field of air and water pollution, the jurisdiction must cover the entire natural hydrographic and atmospheric basins in order to reach the total problem area. The recreational interests of people were less and less controlled by distance.

In the second place, evidence proved that land use control was beyond the ability of local leaders to handle.

Zoning is an element in the economic value of land since it helps create this value, but the practice of councils and boards of supervisors treated it as a personal, not a public, function. Zoning changes in many areas were granted as a way of providing advantages to friends and supporters. It appeared to be well within the moral fabric of some communities for the leaders to use variances and special use permits as dispensations to friends and supporters -- the right to grant them a perquisite of local public office.

If it were local government programs and nonprograms that permitted the downgrading of urban areas and the spread of the slurbs, certainly it was the Federal and State policies and programs that helped make this result inevitable. For example, there was no doubt that Federal taxation and fiscal policies actually encouraged the dispersion of urban growth and the speculation in urban and fringe property.

The shelter available to land speculators under capital gains permitted them to credit the costs of holding against the loss if the land did not pay off. If the land did, the higher return was taxable only at the capital gains rate. The gains tax, therefore, made profitable the rapid expansion of property to generate income taxable at the capital gains rate or to create tax deductible losses. In addition, the whole of the local property tax, which is suppose to be a deterrent against increasing prices, is deductible from Federal and State income taxes.

This resulted in single family dwellings, for the most part in the fringe areas. While the property tax tended to reduce land values, the full deduction of mortgage, interest, and local property taxes from the Federal Income Tax countered this tendency, and no manner of land value taxation to discourage speculation affected the upward trend in the valleys of this land.

Not only did State and Federal tax policies encourage sloppy growth, but grant and expenditure programs of senior governments paid a substantial share of the cost of this growth. Over 40 programs affecting urban development were underwritten by Uncle Sam. Federal aid to State and local governments rose from 3 billion in 1955 to an estimated 6.5 billion in 1965. Ninety percent of the cost of interstate highways and 50 percent of secondary roads were paid for by the Federal government.

Federal aid constructed a military base in Nevada, the Central Arizona Water Project, flood control works in the Los Angeles River, and a freeway in the middle of Albuquerque. All of these programs affected the growth and viability of urban areas. Yet, most of these expenditures were not related to the best local development, the best for the Southwest Region; or, for that matter, even related to what was best for the country. In some cases local governments were not even consulted and in others the Federal people dealt directly with cities and counties, bypassing the State. In still others, local government had to fight to prevent construction contrary to its own plans of development.

On the whole, these funds were lent, spent, or given away on a function-by-function basis without plan or priority and without consideration of their general effect on the growth of involved areas or even on the other programs of Federal and State governments. Agencies of both the States and Federal government seemed determined not to spend their money according to a comprehensive plan for the full development of the entire area. Not only was there little functional coordination toward a Federal urban policy, there was no policy. Instead, there were as many policies as there were Federal agencies.

The horrendous effects of growth and the low scale of solution became national scandals. Ad hoc neighborhood organizations sprang up throughout the southwest to defend their land and landscape. These consolidated into metropolitan organizations; then State, and finally national conservation groups, centered in Washington. Privately financed non-profit organizations led the battle -- developed regional, State and national studies and financed open space purchase programs. Enraged citizens stormed city halls, State legislatures and Congress. The Secretary of the Interior wrote a book; the President of the United States gave a speech, called several White House Conferences and sent a great number of bills to the Hill. A number of these passed and were accepted as landmarks in the history of the country.

The most important of these measures established single Federal policies for land, water and recreation and single urban development policies, all of which controlled the various Federal agencies functioning in each of these various fields.

The principle of the carrot and the club was deliberately used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the various Federal landlords to gain rational area-wide planning and administration and to achieve State and interstate developmental policies and programs.

In the first place, all Federal grants and capital improvement programs were conditioned on area-wide planning and administration. Special grants to States to assist area-wide administration on a matching basis induced the creation of regional agencies through which the States also administered programs of area-wide influence. These regional agencies, under the guidance of State goals and development needs, assumed the responsibility of coordinating all Federal and State developmental programs within the region.

In the second place, local land use decisions of area-wide importance were transferred to the newly established regional governments, but all developmental decisions from any level of government could be appealed to a State Review Commission on Environmental Change. The commission focused public attention on developmental decisions which affected the environment and, therefore, the long term general welfare. The commission was empowered to hold hearings and make findings and recommendations to local, State and Federal agencies regarding proposed developmental programs. The recommendations of the commission were advisory only, but they had the very important effect of calling attention to the general interest involved in decisions that had been unwittingly destroying the beauty and productivity of the southwest.

The third factor that helped create the new cities was the full enlistment of electronic data processing as an aid to land-use determinations. Most importantly, it was used to establish Federal, State and regional policy and standards on the optimum size and location of new communities. Fed into machines were urban standards involving natural resources and economic base data, topography, air and water pollution factors, national defense and survival characteristics, the cost of government services, and the transportation of people and goods. The areas under study were then operated to compare actual characteristics against accepted standards to determine possible locations and optimum size for each urban unit in each location.

After some persuasion, the southwest was also able to use systems and models and electronic devises and their overseers to help locate public facilities, develop community values, and furnish quantative values to justify open space for parks, the protection of flood plains, the control of air and water pollution and the enhancement of fish and wildlife. The economists, statisticians, and engineers who for years had delighted in adding up their columns of figures and from these totals had justified the uncontrolled extension of the slurbs now began to furnish the figures for counterbalancing the figures in the columns they had always added up.

For its part, the Federal government realigned its various programs to effectuate development of sound urban units. For example, no Federal money was made available for backstopping growth that was out of control. No additional water was furnished these areas by Federal programs and no transportation systems were subsidized. No housing or Federal loan money or mortgage guarantee programs were used in these areas. While the Federal loan and grant programs were no longer extended to overbuilt and unsound local development, Federal aid funds and special Federal tax inducements and public facility construction programs were extended to new areas for the construction of new cities.

217-692 O-66—9

In quick order and contrary to the engineers and statisticians who continued to exude self-fulfilling prophecies that downgraded urban beauty, cities of the future built to human scale began to appear in controlled, healthy and beautiful environments. Metropolitan areas began a slow and planned metamorphosis toward soundly balanced communities -- economically, socially and culturally. With rapid breakthroughs in the transportation of people and goods resulting from heavy Federal subsidy on research and development, the automobile disappeared from the freeways and the smog lifted from the skys. Freeways were bulldozed off the land but the land was left as green-belt separators between urban developments within metropolitan areas and as green walking, hiking and riding fairways between urban communities. Beauty was built into our cities as they grew, as a product of the growth itself, and beauty became an accepted and important responsibility of government.

DISCUSSION ON DEALING IN FUTURES

Discussion among panelists, between panelists and Council members at the National Advisory Board Council meeting, Riverside, California, March 28, 1966.

SENATOR FARR: The time has now come for questions and we will start out be asking if any member of the panel has questions for the other panelists.

MR. FREEMAN: Mr. Hochmuth, you said at one point that there was a great future for industrial parks. As a so-called expert -- I am throwing this out for general discussion -- as a so-called expert recently told me, today's industry -- and I mean really today's, by and large is steering away from so-called "industrial parks"; that they want freeway sites where they can put up signs, you know, a big sign on top of the road, neat but big but not too gaudy.

Would you care to comment on this? This was a distinct change to me. I understood that you said that industrial parks were the things of the future but this expert said no, and he is doing a lot of investigating and research work on this.

MR. HOCHMUTH: This is a strange thing. Many of the industrial parks are being located alongside freeways, which gives me an idea. Our Santa Monica plant is just off the freeway. We don't have our signs up yet, but I will take it back with me.

While I have the opportunity, I was struck a little bit about what Dr. Wood said about zoning, zone variances and tax shelters as far as land is concerned.

You know, we do all these things but I think there is a very simple answer to taking the burden off the county planning directors and the county supervisors as far as zoning variances, because if they don't get into zoning or zoning variances, they are in a sense taxing someone who might get some appreciation of land value from a change of zoning.

We pay the capital gains tax and rather than get a 25 percent base maybe it should be a 75 percent base. Maybe then we won't have the same depreciation of land value.

SENATOR FARR: Do you want to comment on that Dr. Wood?

DR. WOOD: I would go a step farther. I would take -- even with capital gains at 25, I would return it to the communities and not give it to Uncle Sam at all. This would permit the communities to perform better, for devising better development programs and for actually encouraging other tax incentive programs the preservation of agricultural land and open space land for use by the public.

MR. HOCHMUTH: Well, let me say this -- I'm talking about capital gains or tax shelter so far as land is concerned and nothing else.

SENATOR FARR: Let's open this up to the panelists. Do any panelists have any questions? If not, we will throw it open to the public.

MR. BRUCE ANDERSON: Well, I have a very serious question to ask.

In speaking of industrial parks in public lands, I was wondering of one of the three temporary acts that went through the '65 Congress -- is it possible to say that if I, as an individual wished to develop an industrial park on public land -- would it be possible under that act for an individual to go to the Department and negotiate and build an industrial park?

MR. HOCHMUTH: In answer to your question, with the exception of one term that you used, "negotiate," because under Public Law 886, temporary sale of public lands, there is no negotiating on the part of the individual in that program, but it is a competitive bid. That's why I suggested that to go around that defense, I think it would be better in this way to let the local communities purchase this land because the local community can buy at a fair market value but not at a negotiated value. So you see -- you could, as an individual, go out and purchase the land and use your own money and get it classified and get your county to accept a plan for that area because as I recall it, you get the full fee of the land without any restrictions.

MR. STRINGHAM: Would institutions of higher learning be considered for one of these locations?

MR. HOCHMUTH: Yes, it is a tremendous consideration in my industry because of the necessity for engineers -- I think it's a little bit of medical, industrial, professional people, and so having access to culture and educational facilities, and it is very important.

MR. ANDERSON: I have another one I would like to ask Dr. Wood.

It sounded as if there may have been some places that are somewhat more advanced than we are, and I would be interested to know if there are any trouble factors to define what you are speaking of, of what you referred to in these communities?

I have read various articles and plans for some foreign countries that sounded very much like those that you discussed.

Incidentally, Moscow has a plan very much along that line -- and I don't say that facetiously, either. I mean, they really do.

DR. WOOD: Well, Sweden has a number of new towns and new cities and England has three or four or more in the planning stage.

But, the point here is, really, that we ought to use some sense about where do we locate communities in terms of what's good sound use and what's best for community development.

Now, we ought to also use some control, I think, and I think the Federal agencies, and BLM particularly, will have opportunity here to use some control on establishing what the optimum size of that community ought to be once it is located, and all these factors ought to be built in.

I think it is a bunch of nonsense, the fact that people can live helter-skelter any place in the southwest or any place in any developing part of the country, move there under the enticement of cheaper houses or cheaper units somehow or other, and then expect the rest of the general taxpayers to bail them out.

Actually, there is a public subsidy in every suburban home of about $13,000 -- from $13,000 to $17,000 -- there's a public subsidy in every guy that drives 40 miles a day, round trip to work and back, of $1,000 a year. Now, these facts have been pretty well established and I don't think that the people have a constitutionally-guaranteed right to go to any place they want to, use any sort of land for residential purposes, or any other purpose they want to, and then expect the rest of the community to pick up the ticket.

JUDGE REA: Mr. Freeman was talking about the high-rise and the fellow who came out here from the East who was talking about the high-rise building. Has there been any consideration given in your county to stopping the use of this vital land, putting it in high-rise buildings?

MR. FREEMAN: No direct consideration that I know of. We have the opposite taking place in La Jolla, which some of you may be familiar with. There's a terrible battle going on there and they have temporarily stopped high rising structures, but this is because it was obstructing the coastal and scenic views which was the case it was laid out for, but inland, 20 miles inland, it may stop somebody's view but, "The greater good for the greater number" perhaps should prevail.

MRS. GLADYS PICKING, CALIFORNIA: I am not concerned about people. I am concerned about cows. I wanted to ask Dr. Reierson on what basis does he base his prediction that the number of dairy cows will decrease while the number of beef cattle increase?

DR. REIERSON: Well, this is really mainly on the basis of the increasing productivity per dairy cow; that this milk production per cow has been going up pretty fast and it has allowed us to decrease dairy cows, maintain or increase milk production.

There is one other thing involved in this and this is that since World War II the consumption of some dairy products has actually declined on a per capita basis, but it is really that this productivity per cow is going up and is expected to continue up for a fair while.

Now, I would agree that sometime we are going to have to stop decreasing dairy cows, but it looks like this is off ten, fifteen years anyway, but perhaps fifteen years from now maybe this dairy cow number will level off and we will then not be able to get this easy substitution of the beef animal just taking up the roughage that some dairy animal previously used.

MR. STRINGHAM: I have another question for Bob Reierson while he is up there, and that is this: What factors do you believe should be considered that would truly reflect a grazing fee formula structure in order to be realistic, sound and practical in the range livestock industry? Is that too long?

DR. REIERSON: Well, the problem is, I am not experienced in the grazing area, or the grazing fee area, but I don't mind making a few comments on this subject, because then I am going to try and go over on the other side of the fence.

I was tempted to respond to Dr. Wood's initial comments because I thought he was making them to stir up some response from some of the other panel members, and this is maybe risky but maybe we seem to be representing single interest groups.

On the other hand -- I am going to come back to your question but this gives me an opportunity to make some other comments. We were asked to take a look at the long range demands into the future on these different areas. This is what I attempted to do, to express what's likely to happen in terms of these long-run demands in the area of livestock, and I think we would all recognize there needs to be some compatability.

But, this ties in with your question in that I feel this -- our initial comments on this panel were as specialists. I know this is what mine was, as a specialist in the area of livestock and what's likely to happen in terms of long-run trends, and then I am going to respond to your question as a generalist.

It would seem to me that in the terms of the establishment of grazing fees, there does need to be some recognition or some kind of a mechanism of a sense of getting some kind of comparable market value, some kind of parallel here that could be used as an economic basis or economic standard or criteria for trying to say, "Well, what would be a reasonable return for this unit?" And I understand that there aren't many operations in which this public land is a critical key to an overall management thing.

But, it seems to me too, then, this should recognize some long term interests and rather than responding to short run fluctuations that, well, this just seem to be so wide in terms of moisture, let's say, in the Midwest and we just didn't have these wide swings in demands for forage or for feed that you do here in the West and, therefore, we get these real wide swings in the sense of market value for forage. So, it seems to me there needs to be some long term thing.

I would presume that there needs to be a recognition here, too, in terms of doing everything possible to improve this roughage resource or improve the carrying capacity, and then I would come back to the fact that I would say, including all this, there does have to be a recognition of the other demands on public lands and some sense here of compatibility between the other demands. I certainly don't know what this is, and I really don't think this is what I was expected to have handled today. To give an easy answer, there really isn't one.

On the other hand, I felt that there is also a point here; this is, that I don't think we can say that recreationists only are consumer-oriented, or someone else is primarily the one that is consumer-oriented. It seems to me that the different areas that each of us discussed today are consumer-oriented in the sense that the product being produced in these different areas is all aimed at the consumer at one time or another and, eventually, at the household consumer primarily.

DR. ROSTVOLD: This question is somewhat related to another question, and is totally unrehearsed, but is in terms of what the Bureau of the Budget is now asking BLM. Is this in terms of costs and benefits in the matter of allocations that are made from the BLM budget? Under the multiple use concept it is quite clear that the Bureau's interests representative will have to meet the needs of the recreationists and of industries, of the slurbs, or the highway people.

We have a pretty good panel represented here and, therefore, I would like to take advantage of all this knowledge and ask each of the interest groups represented here -- and Dr. Reierson has already given part of and answer -- picking up your own interests, wildlife, the recreation, the industry, the slurbs, people, minerals, and forage, what criteria, what measures would each of you use in giving the Bureau of measure of yet another value of what you seek?

Do you follow the question? In other words, what criteria would you have the Bureau use? What actual economic measures of value can you give because the Bureau is going to need guidance along these lines in implementing the multiple use principle?

Now, I will ease it up a little bit. Some of the interests represented on the panel here can convert this to economic terms, but for others the terms will have to be a little more nebulous and, therefore, we can talk in general terms of what it is all about.

MR. GLADING: This gives me an opportunity for another speech.

I would answer that very simply and say on the basis of a day's use. And I say this for the reason that I think that the entire demand is built up by the man who works, who sleeps and who plays and I think that part of this play is on the public lands and part of the play is in the bowling alley, and other places.

However, all of this is part of the gross national product. In effect, you have got 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and so forth, and it all is a part of the gross national product. He has to sleep, and he has to work in order to make his dollar.

First of all, average this as a gross national product out to each individual person, and then average this out to days of the year, and take the days in the year that he spends on public land, and you have a very simple figure. I put this forward because I think it is one that we can all agree on and I will admit that there are some other complications but I submit it for serious consideration.

MR. HOCHMUTH: I think all the uses enumerated in the law -- you are talking about the Multiple Use and Classification Act, or the other way around -- enumerates commercial and industrial uses of public land, but by the very nature that has to be, I think, a single use.

My only answer to that is that while the Bureau of Land Management classifies out that which is to be retained for multiple use purposes, the remainder, or what's left is likely what is to be used for density use, higher density use is what I'd say. Single use -- well, let me put it another way.

You can't have substantial developments on land by private enterprise without either a long term lease or something that amounts to a fee. By that very nature again, you have lost control of it, even if you are industrial. So, I am representing what might be the residual after you classify it for multiple use and essentially you are supposedly retaining it in public ownership.

MR. McCLOSKEY: The method of ratio approach seems to be most useful in conference situations where you have one use competing with another for the same tract of land.

One method of establishing recreational values would be the one that was suggested. That may be a bit revolutionary;there are more official methods.

The limitation on this is that the true value of a recreational experience is not really reflected in any of the economic impacts; nevertheless, you can't measure some of these impacts. To start with, there are the user fees or facility fees for various areas, for national parks, State parks, forest camps, and so on.

There are the expenditures per visitor day of campers, recreationists of various types; the various figures are often as small as a dollar and a half to $15 and $20 a day. When these figures are converted to five visitor days, we get various sums, sometimes as much as millions of dollars.

Then, another measure is the expenditure of recreationists on equipment, on fishing poles, guns, sporting equipment, boats, and so on. These figures are very impressive. None of these figures, though, completely measure the intangible value or the experience per se. If you have a complete pricing mechanism, what is it worth to the person, what is he willing to pay -- some economists estimated that a national park user, for instance, some of them would be willing to pay up as high as $20 and $25 a day. This is not to suggest that anybody would price these things at this level, but they would indicate what value they held to some persons.

If you are just trying to get some common means of measurement for comparative purposes, then you can hypothesize certain figures of this sort. They are meant to suggest just what is the value of the emotional experience. This is never actually reflected in the economy as such.

And, as a method, too, of analyzing the value of recreational expenditures, some people suggest that you take the total recreational experience. The first phase is planning for it and which may take many years of dreaming and thinking about places you want to go, and the second phase is the final experience. It is a long journey and you leave money in your path from one end of the country to the next. The third phase is the on-site experience and how much money you spend when you get there. The fourth is the travel back. The fifth is recollection which may last the rest of a lifetime.

Looking upon a recreational experience in that light, it's pretty impossible to come up with any economic terms.

MR. FREEMAN: I think it is obvious that the question is not the easiest one in the world to answer. Perhaps I should revise my original presentation.

It seems to me that I may be straying from the proper answer here, but there are some other answers in dollars and cents, at least indirectly. Certainly, you wouldn't want to put a bowling alley on a cliff, to use extreme illustrations, and I do go back to soil because that must have something to do with it. The type of soil must be used for what it is

most suitable. Perhaps it can be semimultiple use or partial multiple use if it is available, or suitable for certain types of operation.

DR. REIERSON: I think really a very cold comment seems to me to be in the sense that you have got to look at this gross national product in a sense, "What's the contribution to the different industries that make these possibilities?" Also, what's the contribution in the local community. And recognition of other costs involved in various returns, not only for the individual enterprises but for the local community. then, there is how you tie these together in terms of this compatibility in the sense of priorities.

DR. CAMPBELL: Coming in towards the last of the discussion of this question, I suppose I have to have some advantage, but it's such a tough question that I don't feel advantages.

You know the old saying that "One illustration is worth a thousand words," let me give you one illustration from the point of view of the mining industry. I'll go back to that rare earth deposit in the mountain pass, which some of you have seen, and I think some of you might have discussed it.

As I said, the world's entire supply of europium oxide is being produced there. I knew that area way back before any rare earths had been discovered. I used to camp there nights when I was on some desert trips because it's high up and it's in Joshua tree country and you can get a good night's sleep there even if it is summertime in the Mojave.

Europium oxide is being used for T.V. tubes. If it happened to be me, I couldn't care less because I turn on my T.V. maybe once or twice a month, and I say, "Leave that whole area undisturbed."

But, there's more to it than just the europium oxide. A by-product, or a coproduct -- there are a couple of other rare earths formed in even more difficult veins, lanthanum and disprosium. Those have been discovered through, or to give particular importance to those little ceramic pellets that the Sacony-Mobile Company invented some years ago that gives greatly improved performance to catalysts in the cracking of oil. It gives a greater yield of oil; this is conservation. It produces, to put it in generic terms "the smog content"; this is good -- certainly we want this.

How do you weigh these things? Well, let me give you another little bit of perspective. Last fall, Governor Brown asked me to serve as committee coordinator here on the National Surface and Strip Mining Survey. The objective was to discover as good facts as we could over the entire country, State-by-State and county-by-county, the areas covered by surface and strip mining in relation to each different kind of mineral.

This was a perfect task. Fortunately, we had a lot of data on hand and I think we came up with some reasonable answers.

In California, about two-tenths of one percent acreage represents all the surface and strip mining that has gone on since the days of the first miners. That's not very much of our surface.

Now, according to the multiple use concept, and tying this in with planning ahead, in terms of the mining industry, I think a great deal can be done. For example, one piece, I think the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Mines ran this test in Hawaii where there is opportunity, or there certainly is future potential, for production of bauxite, one of the key cores of aluminum.

What they did was they stripped the surface -- a certain amount of overgrowth had to be stripped -- they stripped out the bauxite ore and they restored the surface material under controlled conditions and the following year they were raising more crops per acre than they had before. This is good conservation. It certainly is a fine example, I think, of multiple use.

We can do the same if we get the whole picture and plan sufficiently ahead.

DR. WOOD: I agree with the advantage in being late.

This is a problem that I have had some contact with over a number of years. I used to work with the Bureau of Reclamation and we thought we made an effort to do a benefit cost analysis on our reservoirs. We devised figures, one way or another, for recreation benefits. For a while we still assumed that the benefit at least was equal to the cost of the recreation facilities and the maintenance of the facilities; but first, this reversal in economics, this will justify any kind of an expenditure.

What I want to point out is that when I was in the private consulting business, I had a contract with the State Department of Water Resources to develop a value for one day of recreation, a direct value. Now, we have been talking about indirect value, but if you are going to compute a value, it has to be to the person who will get the benefit, not to the community around it. That is an indirect value, and when you start adding those things up you can get all sorts of figures.

So, we established some criteria. First, we went out and interviewed the recreation people. We had seminars around the Bay area and southern California to try to get ideas. Well, we were told almost immediately by some of our friends in the Bureau that this was impossible and they didn't want us to even try to do it.

But anyway, we proceeded with this impossible task and we recognized it was impossible, but we finally devised a method of evaluating a day of recreation in the Sierra recreation areas based on how far people traveled.

Now, the figure we got -- the process was reasonable, the figure was reasonable and it is still being used by the State Department of Resources, and I think this is a better figure than trying to add up how much people spend for killing a duck. You get fantastic figures that are not realistic.

I think that what we need to do is to deliberately do what we had to do for the Department of Water Resources. We need to spend the money to devise, get new tools of measurement, economic means of measurement, and I don't think that all these things can be measured either.

I certainly don't think so; you shouldn't even try to measure, but a lot of them can be measured. At the present time the division of highways uses the benefits of a cost-plus-benefit theory. They call this economics.

Well, they can drive a freeway through the middle of San Francisco and pick up enough drivers to justify, economically, the freeway that would pick up all the land, practically, in the city of San Francisco. They wanted it. It's a bunch of nonsense. It's a dishonest figure. They had a dishonest method of justifying freeways, and this is why they were getting by with it.

So, I think what we need to do is to try to put some brains to work and pay the brains enough to get some values that we can add up, and some costs that we can add up, too, and work out some systems and models, and use the computers where it is advisable to use them. I think if we do all this, we will come up with some honest evaluations.

DR. FULCHER: It seems that Mr. Glading took quite a swipe at this conversion. Now, education conversion through spring, and so forth, isn't relatively new to range men. We might at least be interested in having him comment on it because it might have been done originally, but I think we should look at it with some value toward management, for more value of fish and wildlife habitat. I hate to openly condemn it without bringing out all the benefits which might be there.

MR. GLADING: I don't know whether I openly condemned it or not. I think I raised the question of whether or not we were, in all cases, proceeding wisely in our range conversion, and I am sure that in all cases we are not proceeding wisely as far as wildlife is concerned.

As I pointed out, the Department of Fish and Game have made some plans for having wildlife around 1980, and if some of the range conversion that is going on now continues going in the same direction it is going, by 1980 we will have less wildlife around than some of us think we should have.

MR. ROLLAND K. PATRICK, IDAHO: In his statement, Dr. Reierson talked about 1980, what might be happending in those days. I am wondering if we hadn't all better look at feeding the nation, but at the same time if that won't be the most important thing we will have in life at that time, if he thinks that's really important.

DR. REIERSON: Well, I sure think it's important and, of course, there's been much recent publicity about our concern with the standard of living and assumption elsewhere in the world, too, as Senator Farr mentioned in today's newspaper. There's been much concern on this.

I think that as far as feeding people in this country, most of the people who are making projections think that we will be able to keep up with this for a fair while. Most of the projections on agricultural production, particularly crops, in the past have been underestimated. In other words, our agricultural productive plan has exceeded expectations in terms of crop production in the past, and maybe to some extent with livestock products, too.

Certainly, I think that feeding will be important in 1980. My guess is that we will be able to keep up with it all right until then, but it's mainly a matter of what will this mix be of agricultural production and the different kinds of priorities that consumers as a whole will put on as they express this in their dollar expenditures.

And again, coming a little closer to home in the livestock interest, to what will happen in terms of synthetic meats. These have been developed and for such purposes maybe they will come in faster than we think, particularly in processed meat items. On the other hand, I am inclined to think that for a considerable time there will be a strong demand for beef items. The history has been for an increasing preference for beef, and there isn't any sign of this tapering off yet.

It seems to me in a sense the answer you are coming up with on this is different in the next 15 years than it may be for 50 or 75 years from now. Now, I was going to say that eventually we may get into this question, whether we are going to put our priorities between direct consumption of crops by humans rather than running these crops through livestock.

MR. JAMES S. WEBER, OREGON: Mr. Glading, you have mentioned here a feeling that wildlife is getting possibly in a little better position than some of the organized groups such as livestock, mining, and so forth, in competition for Bureau land.

We note there is far more game now than there was 40 years ago. What is it doing at the present time, say the last five or ten years? Are you getting a good increase yet in your game, or are you leveling off, or increasing, or what? I would like to get this in just a general scope.

MR. GLADING: Well, you mentioned that we have far more game now than we had a few years back, or 40 years back, I think you mentioned.

I would agree with this with respect to certain types of game only, and that would be primarily deer and game that's used to living around man's activity, used to a disturbed condition; other species of game, certainly this is not true. It is far from true.

As far as the deer are concerned, yes, we will say that today -- almost today, five years back -- we certainly have more deer than we had 40 years ago, and this is basically because deer, ecologically, are increasing around a disturbed environment. They are not a creature that will climax vegetation of the forest or a complete time situation. They are a creature of the successful phase of the environment.

However, in the last five years -- and who knows whether this is temporary or permanent or not -- we feel that there is a great deal of evidence that deer numbers in the West have peaked out. In other words, Starker Leopold said they peaked out in '50. There is good deal of evidence that they peaked out in the past 10 or 15 years and that increased competition can be sustained by the creature, apparently.

As far as deer numbers are concerned right now, it's not critical or even coming close to being critical. As you well know, there is still plenty of space for cattle and deer to wander on the ranges.

I don't think that my plea was particularly from the standpoint of "Let's have more deer on the ranges." I don't think that was the plea at all. I say, let's have better recreational use of our wild lands and if this involves better use of deer, so be it. I think we should use these deer, though.

SENATOR FARR: Any further questions?

Well, if not, I think this problem the panel has been talking about, which is the best use of the public lands.

There are several comments I can make here. One is that there has been a great deal of interest in agricultue among these groups. There is a book that is put out by the California Department of Planning, the State Office of Planning, and it contains several statements that I think are very interesting. One relates to what Mr. Hochmuth said about where is industry locating.

It seems that the National Registry of Scientific and Technical Personnel, maintained by the National Science Foundation, shows that what is important to mathematicians and physicists of the United States can be found in two metropolitan areas; those of Los Angeles and San Francisco - San Jose. This further estimates that there is a total of somewhere in the range of 112,000 to 150,000 scientists and industrial engineers. I think they located industry largely due to educational institutions within those areas.

There is another comment made here which I think is relevant to Mr. Glading's comment on agriculture. We are talking about land and land speculation. This statement reads as follows:

> "Another feature of present day California's agriculture is that the land speculation belt can only be found in surrounding metropolitan districts, particularly the three largest. In some distances these belts run as wide as 70 miles from the central city. One recent study, for example, reports that no new agricultural land sales have taken place in Sonoma County for five or more years."

It further adds that:

> "Land is a little volatile; that land with little possible urban site value for ten to 20 years, sells at two to ten times the capitalized value to farming. When these conditions prevail, farm operations cannot be expected to be progressive on land range."

I think we do have to bear in mind, particularly here in California, as well as many other places in the West, that we only have a certain amount of public land; we only have a certain amount of public and private land; that we are going to have more and more people. We have about 500,000 and now it is soon going to be 600,000 new people in this State every year. These people must depend upon this land for schools and proper recreation facilities.

So, I think it does behoove us to see that that part of the land that still remains in the public domain is put to the very wisest and best use.

There is one more thing that is a part of the -- it has not been discussed here but it certainly relates to the future and some of this is under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management. What I am talking about is so well expressed in the Chamber of Commerce Bulletin that I would like to read this:

> "Although he has lived on the earth for more than a million years, man has barely dipped into what is this planet's richest resource. Roughly three-quarters of the earth's surface, the sea, holds in its vastness enough protein, fish and plankton to nourish half the world's people. Huge reserves of oil and gas lie beneath the ocean floors. Littered about these murky floors are pure mountains of manganese, cobalt and copper. What else awaits man's discovery down there no one yet knows."

217-692 O-66—10

And this is why the Continental Shelf is under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management. So, I think that when we are thinking about the future, the public lands, we must think about the ocean bottom, particularly that portion of the ocean that belongs to us.

With that, I think I will now turn the meeting over to Charles Stoddard, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

DIRECTOR STODDARD: Well, I want to give my thanks to all the panel members for the fine job they did in dealing in futures. It was a fine job. It's a job which, when we look ahead to see where we are, it is certainly a challenge but we have got to think our way through a good many of these problems. This is one of the reasons for our meeting here in southern California is to see, and I might say to smell, some of the problems which we are developing.

My home State is Wisconsin, as some of you know, and Senator Nelson, who's a former governor, came back to campaign there and went to school at Santa Cruz and he hasn't been out here for some time, and he said, "Well, I've seen California and I've seen the future and it won't work."

California has the job of paying for it but we have also got the job of learning from the experience here that you had and you have got the job of repairing the damage and we have got the job also of preventing it on this public land.

All of the panelists, I think made fine contributions but Sam Wood's idea of starting to look back and the computer solving all of our problems was certainly a nice, happy way of wishing them away.

I don't have the faith in computers that some people do, but we have to use them now. We are getting more and more of them back in the Bureau, and we are stuck with them all right. I think the problem is what goes into the computer. It is still a human problem of organization and people and the kind of people and whether they are able to think about their problems and figure them out.

The other problem that I think we have touched on here today is the old question of here we have various interests and viewpoints in the public lands. These are -- we talk about this multiple use as a great wastebasket that we throw all these things into. Multiple use is really a multiple problem. Multiple problems really have multiple interests and multiple agencies, and we are one here in a whale of a big government.

We have been trying, in our own way, to figure out some means of relating our problems to the local governments; relating our management to the greatest users that are interested in the use of the land, and we are going to be hacking at this question further on Wednesday after the field trip tomorrow where you will see some of the types of problems that are starting here in southern California and may be upon us sooner than we realize, and in other parts of the West, if we don't get busy.

In other words, we can see this development coming. Now, what are we going to do about it; how are we going to manage it? They asked the Bureau of Land Management to solve it and you know, that is really something because after all, we are a pretty old agency, and not a new agency with all of these wonderful things.

Now, this is the note that I wanted to close on, that we do need the help of all of you members of the advisory council in coming to grips with this. How do we get and use this guidance for developing the long term plan that we need and hold together these uses so we can have the kind of a standard of living that we want and the kind of a country that we want. We really have to figure it out now. It's going to be up to us in the next 25 years to see what the direction is going to be. If we don't face the challenge, why we are going to pass on to the future a different story from the one that you described.

REPORT FROM THE PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION
Address of Mrs. Nancy Smith, County Supervisor, San Bernardino County, California, and Member of the Public Land Law Review Commission, To the National Advisory Board Council on March 29, 1966.

Thank you, Mr. Stoddard. Judge Hughes, Directors, Assistant Directors, Division Heads and all you distinguished ladies and gentlemen. Let me say this relative to your mention of my husband, I often say when I am out speaking and as a matter of fact all the time, a woman in public office certainly has to have an understanding husband and I'm very fortunate in having one that permits me to do the things that I like, and if we did not have this very happy arrangement, I could not accomplish the things that people have been kind enough to give me the opportunity to accomplish, so Lowell, I thank you again.

I know that you people from the various levels and the various states and counties, have already been welcomed to Southern California, but it is such an honor to have the National Advisory Board and all you Bureau of Land Management officials meeting in Southern California, that I want to add my welcome to the ones that you have already received. So, welcome again. Also, while I am from the neighboring county of San Bernardino and of course, I always have to get in this little personal pitch, the largest county in the United States, 20,160 square miles, I must point out that you are visiting in Riverside County which is the home of Supervisor Paul Anderson, who is currently the President of our California Supervisors Association, and of course, we are very proud of Paul. He has accomplished a great deal in local government. Also, I see Bill Jones, Chairman of the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. It's nice to be associated with gentlemen who are of such high caliber and who are accomplishing so much in local government.

Now, I have been asked to tell you something of the activities of the Public Land Law Review Commission and it seems quite appropriate at this time - since we had our, or I should say the first meeting for me, actually the third meeting of the commission, this past week in Washington. First, I think perhaps I should go into a little of the history of the Public Land Law Review Commission, background of it, how it came into being. Over a period of time, it became apparent to Congressman Wayne Aspinall of Colorado, who as you know, has been the very competent chairman of the very important house committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He and many of his colleagues in both

Houses of Congress realized that it was high time that the many, many, laws relating to the public lands were updated, modernized and thoroughly reviewed in order to make them applicable to the present day needs and our tremendous growth in population. Accordingly, after proper hearings were held in both Houses of Congress, a bill was passed, with some amendments on the Senate side, which were approved by the House side, and on September 19, 1964, Public Law 88-606 came into being which created the Public Land Law Review Commission. Since there are something like 5,000 laws and possibly a 1,000 policies, and I think Mr. Stoddard or some of you people of the Bureau of Land Management can verify that relating to the public land, this was indeed a task to contemplate. I think that those of us on the commission become a little overwhelmed every time we think of those 5,000 laws and 1,000 policies. These laws have been enacted over a period of years, since the Northwest Ordinance of 1785 and it appears that many of them were enacted with little thought as to what had gone before. Therefore, there are conflicts and overlapping. As our country expanded westward from the 13 colonies the public lands in the midwest and the eastern regions were nearly all settled and utilized.

Therefore, the huge bulk of the remaining public lands dedicated to public uses as well as those not committed by any legislative authority are in the 11 western states and Alaska. Here in the vastness of the west approximately 50% of all the land is under some type of government ownership. The exact amount of acreage varies from state to state and from county to county, so you can't say its 50% and think of it in those terms. Because for example, in my county 78% of all the land is in some form of government ownership, not all of that is public land, it may be other public agencies. In Inyo County in California, they only have 1 or 2% in private ownership. So you see it becomes very difficult for local governmental agencies to have a tax base from which to receive the funds to provide the services that this burgeoning population demands. Now those of you who come from the north-central states or the south or the gulf states or the north or the New England states, please don't think that because we talk so much of the great bulk of the public lands being in the West that we are only going to be concerned with the west on the study. This is certainly not true. This is all the United States and we are just as concerned with every area of the entire United States and we expect to give every area with public lands due consideration. We'll try to do our best by everyone of you. I am very much impressed with the ability and the sincerity and the integrity of the members of the Public Land Review Commission. As I said earlier, they had met twice before, in July and August, and those were simply organizational meetings.

At the first meeting a Chairman was chosen. Perhaps I didn't mention though, the composition of the commission. As you know, there are six members from the House of Representatives, three of each part, six members from the Senate, three of each party and six members appointed by the President of the United States. A chairman was chosen, which makes 19 members. Congressman Aspinall was chosen as the Chairman. Milton Pearl was selected as the Director, and he, too, has wide experience in public lands having been the Executive on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee with Congressman Aspinall. A competent staff has been chosen and I am very hopeful about the work that is to go forward. My only concern is that time may get away from us, because as you know we are expected to come up with recommendations to the Congress and the President at the beginning of 1969. But to get back to Public Law 88-606 and I think it would perhaps be just as well if I read from the Act to you. "This is an Act for the establishment of a Public Land Law Review Commission to study existing laws and procedures relating to the administration of the public lands of the United States. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that the public lands shall be retained, and managed (and this is a most important part of the Act) to be retained and managed or disposed of all in a manner to provide the maximum benefit for the general public." The duties of the Commission are to study the existing statutes and regulations governing the retention, management and disposition of the public lands, review the policies and practices of Federal agencies with administrative jurisdiction over these lands, compile data necessary to understand and determine the various demands on the public lands, which are likely to exist in the foreseeable future and recommend such modifications as appear to be necessary.

In addition to the members of the commission, at the second meeting a 25 member Advisory Committee was named and this is to represent a broad, cross-section of all the users of the public lands.

I think probably all of you people present are aware of the various uses of the lands. Cattle, grazing, sheep, gas and oil, education, almost every use that you can mention, and this 25 member committee is to represent this very broad, cross-section of the users of the public lands. In addition to this, the Federal agencies such as the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and the other agencies are to send representatives to the meetings to work with us and give us background information.

The first order of business at our meeting last Thursday and Friday, and as I said this was my first meeting with them - the other two

had been organizational. The first order of business was a very brief session with the Chairman, at which time we discussed some minor administrative matters and then we went into a general session in the auditorium in the Senate Building, where all of the members of the Advisory Committee and the Governors representatives and press and public were present. The first presentation was made by the Under Secretary of the Interior, Mr. John Carver, who will be working closely with the Commission. In his opening statement he reminded us that the head of each Federal department or independent agency which has an interest in or responsibility with respect to this retention, management, or disposition mentioned in the Act, appoint a Liaison Officer to work with the Commission. The Department of the Interior interest and the responsibility probably transcends that of any other department. Statutory instructions are to "work closely" with the Commission and to "advise and counsel" the Commission. He proceeded then to give us a very learned report on the acreage in public lands in his department and the development of the laws pertaining to them, beginning with the Northwest Ordinance of 1785. (If I were to start giving you the number of acres in public lands in the various states that could go on all evening).

He pointed out that the challenge that President Johnson has given America to build a great society calls for a society of quality, and that is what we are expected to emphasize. Getting acquainted with the Department of the Interior and the very fine people working in that and the Department of Agriculture, I have the feeling that they are concerned with quality. The thrust of the new conservation, said Mr. Carver, is creativity, that the profit motive is probably on the conservation team and that the role of industry in research and development, along with governmental regulations and governmental research can be compatible and that the Public Land Law Review Commission will foster mutual trust and confidence between the two branches of government and between the people and our government. After a recess, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. John A. Baker, also made a presentation, pointing out his relationship and responsibility in the Department of Agriculture to that of the Commission. Those being his direct responsibility for the public lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and his responsibility for the development of rural areas affected one way or another by the management and use of all the public lands. He further pointed out, that there are ten year programs for both national forestry research and the national forest system which outlines the planned scope and direction of numerous related activities, and those programs are public information. After lunch, several other people from the agencies working with

us spoke: Mr. Point from the Department of Defense, Mr. Moorehouse representing Mr. Fisher from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Ramey made a presentation from the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Moody from the General Services Administration and Mr. Pearl read a paper from the Federal Power Commission.

Friday morning all the members of the Commission and the Advisory Council as well as the Governors representatives were divided into eight different groups. Present also were the speakers of the previous day who were acting as resource people. Chairman Aspinall felt that the results of these group meetings would be invaluable in that they would develop additional important aspects to be considered during the study of the Commission. He felt this was more of an educational program with an exchange of ideas and the points emphasized should be what the overall objectives of the commission were to be. Should there be an in-depth study? If so, what aspects were to be specifically studied. In addition to the prepared statements read by some of those who were on the program of the small group meetings, perhaps one of the most important questions brought up was, what is to be the specific function of members of the advisory group. I think some of them probably felt that perhaps they were an appendage that perhaps wouldn't have an important function and they are all busy people who have very important responsibilities in their individual fields and they certainly wanted to be contributors to the study which was facing us. I think their questions were answered in that they were told that the particular hats that they were wearing were the interests they were to represent. Now, we members of the commission represent all the people of the United States. We only have one hat and that is the hat of all the people of this great country. But those members of the advisory commission represent certain specific interests and uses of the public lands. This was brought out again later in the afternoon when we met again in the Senate auditorium with all members of the commission, all the advisory council again, the Governors representatives and members of the press and public. To show you the kind of interest that is being evidenced in the work of the Public Land Law Review Commission, Chairman Aspinall pointed out that during the morning session - there were 175 people present in the eight different groups. The afternoon meeting was a general wrap-up of what had taken place before. During this time questions were answered pertaining to the work ahead and outline of the work as relates to the commission. Because the statute specifically states that the advisory commission shall meet six months after the meeting of the commission, it was felt it would be far better to have the Commission meet with them and so six months from last week's meeting will be September 15, 16, 17, and we will meet in Denver

provided that the Congress has adjourned. If it hasn't, of course, we will have to meet in Washington because 12 members are from the Congress.

There was some humor in this final afternoon session of the meeting. I might read you a few excerpts from the minutes. For instance, I mentioned the fact that the advisory members represent certain specific interests and so Dr. Childs from the Colorado School of Mines raised his hand and was recognized and he said: "Mr. Chairman, I feel disposed to ask you another question, because in your statement that the advisory council had been chosen to represent special interest groups, some of us may become rather uncomfortable, because I don't have a special interest group. Am I supposed to go get one?" Chairman Aspinall answered with a little smile on his face, "Don't you consider that the educational processes of the United States are at least a specially oriented group as far as the welfare of the country is concerned? At least you are on there, partly as an educator as well as a scientist." So you see education also is a special use of the public lands. One of the speakers, as I mentioned earlier, had been from the General Services Administration and that prompted Congressman Saylor from Pennsylvania to rise and be recognized and he said: "Mr. Chairman, I have nothing profound to say, except I want to comment publicly on Joe Moody's comment yesterday. I'm sure this isn't going to happen, but he said on page eight "Many of the papers undoubtedly will be vital to the implementation of the commission's recommendations and some will become historically significant to the public land management laws, policies and practices of the Federal Government. You may be assured that the appropriate preservation will receive our best professional, archival attention." Congressman Saylor added, "Ladies and Gentlemen, I assure you that I am not going to see that the recommendations go into the archives. I want to see that the recommendations become the law of the land." So there was a good deal of laughter over that one. I'm sure we all felt the same way. Of course these will be historic, but we hope that they will be recommendations that Congress will feel are practical and can be put into use. Throughout the session, the feeling was expressed that a compatibility can be reached among all the uses. In years gone by there have been many so-called purists who have felt that a single use of public land is all that could possibly be considered, but today as our population increases and the thought of a three or four hour work week comes more into our range of thinking, the multiple-use concept seems to be more accepted and I think that everyone there was expressing the thought that not only would we have the courage to come up with conclusions after proper study, but that certainly compatibility was to be recognized and that seemed to be the general thinking throughout the meeting.

Actually, I just wish that I could tell you that we had arrived at some dynamic conclusion or that some very specific suggestions had been made last week, but its really too early to say that. All I can say to you is that the study is underway, the commission has met, we are all deeply concerned about the problems confronting us. I think the fact that there are some 5,000 laws needn't be too staggering, because as Mr. Stoddard and I were saying awhile ago, there are just a few laws which are so prominent and are so needed.

For instance, the Small Tract Act, which we sometime ago found impractical in our county. The Mineral Leasing Laws and the Mining Laws certainly need to be updated. The Desert Entry Laws, various other laws will need consideration, but I don't think the fact there have been so many laws needs to stagger us to the point that we will be overwhelmed and not accomplish what the nation is expecting of us. As you know, there have been three previous Public Land Law Review Commissions. I think the last was in Teddy Roosevelt's day. We would hope that this one, where the need is so prominent today, will come up with a review, and a study and recommendations that are going to meet the needs of the public today and for the future.

I was rather interested in a carbon copy of a letter I received which was addressed to the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Anderson, for public land management in the Department of the Interior, sent by my Congressman from San Bernardino County, Ken Dyal, in which he mentioned that the early settlers in San Bernardino arrived in the year 1851 and at that time there were only 5,523 persons in all the State of California. Today we are approaching 20 million people in the State of California, and as someone said earlier, when he left one state he traded land problems to come to California to get people problems. We stop to think that we are rapidly approaching a national population of 200 million and I am just afraid to say how soon we may reach 300 million. I think even the wildest projectors are a little leary of saying just how soon we may have a population of 300 million. Even though realizing that we have literally hundreds of millions of acres of public land, we will need to make the greatest use of these for homesite, industry, recreation, for all these uses in order to satisfy the needs of the exploding population. So even though I can't tell you we made dynamic decisions last week in Washington, I can tell you that you have a Commission working for you which is determined to come up with proper recommendations and we hope that when 1969 rolls around, we will have something worthwhile to offer the Congress. I might close with a little story that a gentleman from South Carolina gave in the committee which I chaired

Friday morning. He said that a northern gentleman has come down to South Carolina and had gone to a restaurant to have breakfast and he was served eggs and hominy grits which is the usual breakfast there, but he had never had hominy grits before. So after he had eaten them, the waitress said, "Did you like the grits?" He said, "yes, pretty good, but are they much trouble to grow?" She said, "oh, they are no trouble to grow, but they sure are heck to pick up."

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP ROSTER

Industry Use Committee

John Crow, Cochairman
Associate Director

Bruce Anderson
Colorado (oil & gas)

Arnold Bolle
Montana (forestry)

Edward W. Clyde
Utah (petroleum)

W. Howard Gray
Nevada (mining)

Vard H. Heaton
Arizona (sheep)

Ray Lincoln
Idaho (sheep)

J. Leonard Neal
Arizona (cattle)

Roy Young
Nevada (cattle)

Doyal Stiles
Idaho (wildlife)

George N. Swallow
Nevada (sheep)

Resource Management Committee

Eugene V. Zumwalt, Cochairman
Assistant Director-Resource Management

Erwin Christensen
Montana (sheep)

Henry C. Gerber
Oregon (cattle)

Leonard Horn
Colorado (cattle)

Othel L. Pay
Utah (wildlife)

Clarence H. Quinlan
New Mexico (sheep)

Eldon P. Smith
Montana (wildlife)

James S. Weber
Oregon (sheep)

James S. Whaley
Wyoming (soil conservation)

John E. Wood
New Mexico (wildlife)

Public Use Committee

Robert E. Wolf, Cochairman
Assistant to the Director

Bruce Bowler
Idaho (recreation)

Theodore Conn
Oregon (wildlife)

Arthur J. Harris
Alaska (statewide)

John B. Laxague
California (sheep)

Francis A. LeSourd
Washington (statewide)

Lester R. Stewart
California (cattle)

Briant H. Stringham
Utah (sheep)

Robert V. Thompson
Wyoming (cattle)

H. Lee Trejo
Wyoming (wildlife)

Community & Governmental Affairs Committee

Jerry A. O'Callaghan, Cochairman
Chief, Office of Legislation and Cooperative Relations

Kumen S. Gardner
Utah (cattle)

Rolland K. Patrick
Idaho (cattle)

George C. Ricca
Arizona (county government)

Gerhard N. Rostvold
California (urban-suburban)

Mark Wagner
Colorado (wildlife)

William A. Williams, Jr.
New Mexico (soil conservation)

John W. Hay, Jr.
Wyoming (sheep)

Public Information & Education Committee

Dan Saults, Cochairman
Information Officer

Gene J. Etchart
Montana (cattle)

Homer Harrison
California (wildlife)

Al Ray Jonez
Nevada (wildlife)

Max T. Layton
Arizona (wildlife)

Lloyd Rea
Oregon (county government)

COMMENTARY ON FIELD TRIP

Comments of Roscoe E. Bell, President, Western States Land Commissioners Association, on the field tour and other aspects of the meeting to the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 30, 1966.

Judge Hughes, Members of the Council, Friends, and Former Associates with BLM, Guests: It's really a rare privilege for me to be here, to renew acquaintances, to touch base on some of the things that BLM is doing and to participate with you in the program. I appreciate it greatly.

Before I get started, I think I ought to square away and have a little spar with your Director here. He made a snide comment which touches the quick with me and any Alaskan about Seward's Folly. I just happen to have some things here. I will present you with an annual report of the Division of Lands and what it tells that proves that it wasn't a folly. Facts presented show that even lands of today have in the last seven years, or almost seven years, since statehood, produced more net return than the total cost of the State. Now, this is just the Division of Lands, and does not include taxes, but I want you to study this and no more comments about Seward's Folly.

I want to congratulate you, Chuck, and your staff, on a well planned and, I think, highly productive conference. It's a job well done and one that you can be very proud of.

My job on the program is to make a commentary on the field trip yesterday. When I originally got the correspondence on this it was supposed to be a critique, and I got to figuring, "Well, what's a critique?"

About a week ago, I flew down the Kenai Peninsula and took a helicopter and flew out to some of the platforms in Cook Inlet, on some of the permanent platforms, two platforms for oil development in the inlet where the ice is flowing back and forth with the tide. As we got back from this trip, the leader of the trip said that we would have a critique at the "Top of the World" at Anchorage's Westward Hotel.

It turned out that he brought drinks for the group and that was the critique. And then, I began to get concerned and I thought, "That's quite an obligation. The BLM offered to pay my expenses down here, but that wasn't included." I was glad to see that the program said "commentary" rather than "critique." That didn't scare me half as much.

I would like to briefly talk about your program as an Alaskan and as President of the Western States Lands Commissioners Association, and then as something of a land planner and land administrator through the years. This is rather a large order to cover in a half hour's time. However, if you will hold your hats, I will try to go through it rather fast.

As an Alaskan, it is a real privilege to get into a group like this and to take a field trip as we took yesterday, and see some of the things that have developed. We might say, "What a mess." And, then this comes back to "What are we doing to avoid it?", the problems that you see reflected here.

After 50 years, 75 years, or 100 years of experiencing land management or land disposal or land activity, you see some situations created that make you stop and think. Are we creating some of the things that we now identify as problems, capitalizing and encroaching on them. Are we doing some of those things?

We have tried to remind ourselves through the past several years, "What are we trying to do to avoid the problems that have been found and seen in other states and that are being experienced in other states, and we appreciate these opportunities to share experiences, to see these things on the ground, to see how you are meeting the problems in the way that they are created in normal growth and activity, and to re-examine what we are doing in the management of state lands in Alaska and in relation with BLM in management of Federal land, recognizing that in Alaska about 99 per cent of the land is either state or Federal so that the Government dominates the land picture much more than it does with the areas and the type of land that you have here.

So, there is greater responsibility resting upon those of us who are involved in the land management business in the States. We like to pick the brains of those of you who have had experiences elsewhere, to review those experiences, see what you are doing, what is happening, and then to re-examine our own philosophies and our own operations and say, "Do we have sufficient wisdom?" And, we know we don't.

We don't make any bones about it. We call on the higher powers for judgment beyond our own in meeting these responsibilities that the state is going to live with a long time in the future.

They are serious responsibilities with the staff of the Division of Lands as well as the BLM staff in Alaska who take the responsibility seriously.

Now, the Land Commissioners and members of this Western States Association are very appreciative of this opportunity of sharing and looking at things because we are involved. We Land Commissioners sit back and let BLM take all the bumps for a mismanagement in which there are state lands. We never speak up and defend--or we don't very often--and we sometimes chime in with what a lousy job BLM has done. I speak with a little more freedom because I have been on the other side of the fence, and I am speaking from experience in that field, too.

But, we have some responsibilities that we need to carry in a cooperative way for state and Federal lands and intermingled as they are in most of the areas. There are some things about the management of state lands in all the states--Alaska is a little different in some respects--but in all of the states, there are some things about the management of state lands that may indicate people are on the other side of the fence. I would like to emphasize this because you remember that the Statehood Grants were made, grants of land for civic purposes, schools mainly, schools under Sections 16 and 36, and in some states, four sections per township, so then these grants were made for specific purposes. The grants of land were a trust that was placed on the state, and the state has had to manage these lands for revenue. They cannot be managed for general public welfare in the sense that Federal lands can be managed.

So, the lands are different in this respect. I think we will have to recognize that we have a very important obligation on the part of the State Land Commissioners to so manage the lands.

We want to emphasize also--and the Land Commissioners are never supposed to do this--that these land grants were made at the time the states were created; the land grants have not all been satisfied, the in lieu grants or the exchange in lieu selections have not all been satisfied. This is the first call, the first obligation of the Federal Government is to satisfy those grants. And we don't miss any opportunities to emphasize this. It is the first obligation to satisfy those grants.

This is why, on one of our stops and there was a nice piece of a hill --a very, very valuable piece of Federal land--I asked the question, "Well, now, isn't this something that Ken Smith or Lynn Foit from California has a right on to pick up to satisfy the grant?" This is something that would qualify, that would be valuable for the schools.

Well, the answer was non-committal, but they didn't seem to think there was any particular reason why they shouldn't. So, the state has to buy lands, if they are available, to fulfill their responsibility to build up the trust that they have for schools, and we need

217-692 O-66—11

to develop a good appreciation of that obligation in our operations, in both BLM and the State.

Now, as a Land Commissioner, and primarily an Administrator, I would like to make some comments on the tour itself.

The tour was well planned and well executed. I think that you can be proud of it, Chuck, and your staff, and Hall McClain and his immediate staff, for the job they did in lining it out and preparing the brochure that is informative, pointed, helpful, and it had enough information in it so that you knew what you were seeing.

A lot of the things we saw posed some rather staggering questions, questions that I would propose to answer. I couldn't answer all of them because I am leaving at 3:30, but that would be some of the circumstances under which I would propose to answer them. But there are some staggering questions, a wide range of them.

I have selected only a few that seemed most obvious to me and perhaps the most interesting, but there are some real problems posed in the land pattern here. There will probably be some alternative solutions, and you might even consider going above them. But of course, you may or may not agree with me and that's my responsibility. This is all right, too. I hope that it might stimulate our thinking a little.

Overall, in an area as large as this, it's difficult for me to conceive, of looking at the job there is to do, unless I can see an overall picture of the county or the area and get some overall, some overview.

Now, this can be a horseback view or, an airplane view, or a jet view of the area, and a map of this sort--now in terms of maps--this map had to be prepared on a small scale so that with a felt tip pen in hand with which you draw your lines, the lines would be at least a half a mile or a mile wide, so it doesn't give the appearance of being something solid. But, to prepare an overview that shows the relationship of the reserved areas, the small tract areas, the other types of areas in generalized land use plan.

I think that in my work with staffs who are working on things of this sort, they tend to feel, "Well, we are not necessarily professional planners," and this planning, with a capital "P" is a fine art, an art that belongs to the man who has a lot of geography and economics, and so on in his background, and he is probably a cartographer on top of it, too.

But, the meat of a plan that is prepared is how good, how solid is the judgment that goes into it, and so, this kind of an overview would be helpful in seeing where we are going in general, or where we are specializing, and then the refinements can come in the specific areas.

Again, a plan that is made is not a permanent plan by any means. You do have to have a reset every few days because once the plan is made it is modified. Things happen to change from day to day and yet it has to be subject to change.

I don't think we can afford--and I say "we," meaning those of us in the land business--the luxury of the delaying to come to some conclusions about the direction we are going. I don't think we can afford that luxury because we will make mistakes by default. We don't make them intentionally, but we might decide to make some on purpose so at least we can say it was an error in judgment. We don't do it by default, because it is much worse, I think, to make mistakes by default than by commission.

We can well underscore at this point the features that are involved in the new legislation that is being implemented at this time, the feature of local collaboration, planning together, working together with everyone that is interested, and emphasizing the responsibility of the local people to do their planning. This is a real responsibility and one that is a natural to work with.

The BLM field people for years, having been on both sides of that fence, too, have always cussed the stupidity of the Washington office, rightly or wrongly, Chuck, but anyway, they have always done this, and probably with some merit, because distance doesn't always enhance the view. Distance frequently obliterates the important considerations.

We profess a belief in democracy; we profess a belief in grass roots --or maybe I should say joshua tree roots, joshua tree planning-- and we have some reservations about the Federal bureaucrat or the state bureaucrat who will say, "Well, the local group is too subject to pressure."

Your hair stands on end, but in the planning procedures as I visualize they are set up under the new legislation, under the new regulations, the planning procedures provide an opportunity for the Federal planner who has some ideas, to wrack up the plans and ideas and to justify them before a local group that will get the bugs

worked out of it and at the same time can help to perhaps strengthen the judgment of the local group because he does, perhaps, have a little broader perspective, and we need to preserve that prospectus.

So, this is a point of strength, and those of us who believe in this democracy of action and democracy at the grass roots, or the joshua tree roots, this gives us a chance to make it work. I think we have a lot of things to do to make it work and work effectively and we have got a lot of growing pains to go through, but growing pains aren't too painful if you outgrow them.

So, this is a real opportunity and I think it has tremendous advantage in the plans.

Now, I speak from a little experience because of the state law in Alaska adopted by the legislature, the first legislature and a land act, is basically after the same pattern of fact that BLM can operate under. So, I have gone to public hearings and public meetings with fairly well conceived ideas about what ought to be, and I have had the edges knocked off of them. There is one thing that you can say about the Alaskan homesteader, he has some time to think in the winter and he doesn't hesitate. He has ideas and he can knock the bugs out of the planners' thinking in pretty short order. I suspect that in other rural areas--in California, as a matter of fact--planning groups, or county planning groups, can contribute a great deal if the soundness of the idea is kicked out. So I, again, would like to underscore this. I think this is important.

Now, you have the classification of lands for disposal. You have to get into some details on your planning for disposal when you get down to the nuts and bolts of whether you are going to sell this tract or that tract, are you going to sell everything, and how are you going to sell it, and you have to have some goals, some aims in planning this. Your goal may be, "Well, let's get rid of the problem. That's my goal." It may be the answer in some cases; but another goal is to contribute to the sound development of the entire area as a whole, and in this concept it's important.

Another aim is to satisfy legal claimants. I mention this statement, "legal claimant land" and this is a prime responsibility because you have to meet the obligations to legal claimants after the land claims under the laws of the United States and probably predated to our present plans.

Other legal claims, as troublesome as they may be, were illustrated by the person who attended this conference earlier in the week and

attended the conference later in the day, but the legal claimant is the Indian claimant. The native rights claimants are important. They are based on their legal rights, and there are human rights involved that have to be faced seriously and imaginatively. They have to be met and licked. We are in the middle of this in Alaska, so I speak as if I knew the answers, but I don't.

In the disposal of lands, this is a serious responsibility because by the way you sell land, by the way of the timing of the sales, by the size of the tract, you can have a tremendous influence on the real estate market, the availability of land for people, the people who meet land needs, you can have a lot of influence here and it isn't influence that is spelled out in Regulation "X". It's influence that you can either get way out of line and cause trouble, or you can make a real contribution. You can get into politics in a sense of timing being political action--I am not thinking of politics or politicians in connotation with skulduggery, but timing is a matter of political judgment--and the timing of sales may affect the land values in the area or the levels to which arises the availability of land for industrial development. All of these things are important so, you have an influence and a responsibility. But again, you have the possibility of getting the judgment of your local planning or your county planning groups. It's very important to keep these things on an even keel and to develop freedom and timing that will make you stay, or give you a chance to stay on firm ground.

Now, this is a new deal because traditionally,--I say this without too much hesitancy--traditionally, BLM has been too little, too late, and too cumbersome. I don't think any of you would deny any of these things. I wouldn't deny any of them if I was on the other side. Of course, otherwise, there wouldn't be the reason for the Land Law Review Commission because it is to strip away some of the cumbersomeness of operation. That is one of the reasons for this Land Law Review Commission. We have a new set of tools to use, state and others to work with BLM in area forums. You have access to these, so let's try helping, let's reform and make them work.

I would like to underscore again that we have to satisfy the claimants to the land, to the disposal. I think the claimants to the land ought to take priority. I asked Hall McClain, "When you have 14 different applicants for land, you have different laws, who gets the priority?"

I would vote for the legitimate claimants to land under the statehood acts, or other acts involving homesteading, and then go from there.

217-692 O-66—12

Be sure there is conformance with the county and state policy locally. We need long range views on what we are trying to accomplish.

Residential land, you get into some specific questions of wholesale versus retail. I asked, on a number of occasions yesterday, the question, "How is this land laid out, rectangular or contour?"

Most of the small tracts are laid out on the rectangular because you get into flat country and there is no reason why they shouldn't be, because it is traditional. BLM surveyors always think in terms of rectangles anyway, so this is quite natural and there is nothing particularly wrong with it.

There is the question of when you get into the rough areas, these choice residential areas that stand on edge. Then the engineering costs become pretty great and the rectangular pattern, of course, doesn't work at all. Along the waterfront or along the lake, as we do in Alaska, you have to make it conform to the topography, and it's important to make the subdivisions in that way.

Again, on your mountainside areas, which seem to be choice residential areas, if they look down on the right thing, in those areas, the development costs and the planning and development of that area, the aerial photography, the topographic maps, the laying out or the construction of roads, the water systems, and so on, become quite an expensive operation. I think you should look twice--I know we look twice before we get into that kind of operation, because you know how hard it is to squeeze money out of the legislature for that kind of business. If we can sell a plot and get the development--I think it has been demonstrated in the subdivisions we saw yesterday, the high-class subdivisions were not necessarily BLM subdivisions.

The high-class subdivisons that I saw, or at least they looked that way to me, were subdivisions where a tract of land had been subdivided by a subdivider. He had put in the streets and he had laid it out in classic layout and had a high quality of construction. So, I think that we should take a careful look at whether we go the retail or wholesale route.

Now, there are areas where the retail route is convenient, and it's important because there is a clientele that needs land that is willing to buy so-called "cheap land." Usually, it isn't cheap because it may not have water, it may not have streets, it may not have power lines, and so on.

On these industrial fields, you have some different kinds of considerations and Nolan Keil has kicked this around a little bit, but

industrial areas, say, for example, in the Mojave River Valley, that might turn out to be, sometime in the future, visualized as a potential industrial area to decentralize from a central area like Los Angeles. I don't know whether this is a serious consideration or not, but this would be a possibility with the recharge of the ground water and an assured supply of water and power lines, not too far away and railroad lines, too. So, it might be a possibility.

Now, on an area like that, then, what kind of a disposal program should we think about?

Well, it's important to have blocks of land in sufficient size so that they are available to sell to industry, 100 acres, 200 acres, 500 acres, depending on the kind of industry. If you sell to the first man, you have pretty good control on the part of the local planning and zoning commissions, you may get your industrial sites used for--in small pieces, cut up in small pieces, and disposed of--residential tracts and you have made it difficult for an industry to acquire land.

This raises the question, "How can you control it?"

Well, there is one possibility that you can offer it for lease, lease only, a long-term lease, and industries are moving in on long-term leases. There is a problem there because your present laws, as I understand them, provide a maximum of 20 years and a 20-year lease is not sufficient to secure a long-range industrial development. This is my judgment.

Another question is whether you should sell land for cash or on time. Alaska sells it for 10 per cent down, 10 per cent a year, 9 years. This is tailored to Alaskan conditions because we are short on investment capital. We feel that if a fellow has a buck we would rather see him put that buck into development rather than into land costs so we can draw five per cent interest on the unpaid balance, and we have got the land to work anyway. Another thing--of course it's incidental anyway--it does jack up the price of land because people will bid higher on land if they don't have to pay cash for it. This situation probably wouldn't prevail in capital rich California; it probably would not prevail, but at least this is true in Alaska.

Now, on the retention areas, as I look at the balance of land between this stuff--you might say junk--that people settle on, there seems to be a lot more of the same kinds of them and you don't seem to be short on land which would be suitable or useable for these winter homes, homesites or recreation sites. You seem to be pretty well loaded with it, so that the reservations for recreation, these proposed reserves--well, why reserve them? In Alaska we have got a

bellyful of reserves during the years and lands that we have always wanted to use were in reserve, so we have a built-in antipathy to reserves.

But, on the other hand, the balance, as I could catch it from the maps we saw, looked all right as far as first glance. Now, the planning and administration of those reserved areas and the regulations and the reservations--or the restrictions, that is--that were placed are really becoming important. Where possible very careful consideration should be given, I think, to getting the land into local hands, that is, the county, the state groups, for public recreation in areas where it fits into the public recreation plan, because with the advent of the land and water conservation problems, where the recreationists, as a whole, are paying for the use of these local recreation areas, then, the cost should be shared by the maintenance of the Land and Water Conservation Fund rather than the 100 per cent Federal Appropriation where there are local features.

In large areas, I think it would be well to consider going a little easy on the reserved areas where you exclude all forms of entry--mining, and that sort of thing--because you are dealing with large areas. One of the purposes, as we all recognize--and many of these things I am telling you you already recognize, I am not trying to tell you anything new--that multiple purpose becomes important and new minerals, as brought out by one of the panelists, new minerals that have value that may be discovered, may be extremely important in the economy of the state and nation in the future, so we have to keep some happy hunting ground for prospectors for new discoveries and yet accommodate other uses as much as possible.

Multiple use is a fine idea and a fine thought. To put it in practice takes work; it takes planning, and it takes coordination of uses as the people in the oil and gas industry have brought out that you have got to realize the ideal of oil and gas developers being great conservationists, which image they are trying to create. They are doing some good work on it. You have got to work together on specific problems to accommodate the uses so that one does not exclude the other, but so that they contribute one to the other.

If the complete reservation by withdrawal of lands might be limited to key areas, while you are doing your more detailed planning, I think this would be worth considering.

We need to resist some pressures. You have pressures on both sides; you have pressures from the big, bad industrialists; you have pressures from conservationists, which is spelled with a capital "C", which means duck hunters, to some people. We are in a field where

counter-pressures have to be counter-acted by good understanding and careful, intelligent planning and involvement of people in our plans.

Well, some of these things are a little off base, but I do have a couple more that are really quite distressing as far as I was concerned. In an area like Southern California, if I understand the situation properly, where water is as it is in Egypt, the pictures on the walls of the tombs show a man with a key in his hand, the "Key of Life," the The Nile, The Waters. This is true here. Water is the key to life, and these areas still do not have legislative control on extraction of ground water.

Now, this is the way I understand this and I can be corrected. We are trying to be foresighted. We have, hopefully, a bill that will be passed in the Alaska State Legislature this year, a Water Use Act, which will give us a start, a very, very small start, on being able to appropriate and allocate surface and ground water. It's important to make that start. Of course, we don't expect it this year, and I'll be long gone before the population figures will be the same as they are here. But even now, in the midst of an apparent abundance of water, in many areas, the quality of the water, water of suitable property, is pretty scarce in many areas in Alaska. It's an important situation. That's just thrown in on the side.

There was another aspect that got me, and that is to see this good, high-quality agricultural land cut up into subdivisions, orchards pulled out, cut up into subdivisions to produce mediocre quality subdivisions. After all, your choice ones were up on the mountainside, weren't they? But, at any rate, will California have to go to the same extent that Hawaii does where all the land in Hawaii is zoned and you can't take agricultural land and subdivide it in Hawaii. They are being very foresighted on this.

Of course, they have got a fairly substantial puddle of water around them and if they don't produce the food they need locally, why, they might get into a spot where they might go hungry. This is an extreme case, but Hawaii has its problems on zoning the entire state. The entire state is zoned and under land use control.

In conclusion I would like to say that I again have appreciated the opportunity to be here, as an Alaskan, as a representative of the Western States Lands Commissioners Association, as a land pioneer, and land administrator of sorts, and thanks to you, Mr. Stoddard, and best wishes in the year ahead.

PROGRESS UNDER THE CLASSIFICATION AND MULTIPLE USE ACT

Remarks of Rolla E. Chandler, Chief, Land Adjustment Staff, Bureau of Land Management, to the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 30, 1966.

Director Stoddard asked me to give you a brief rundown on the Classification and Multiple Use Act, a bit of the background on it, what we are doing today, the progress we are making, and the way it looks to us in the future.

The Classification and Multiple Act was passed September 19, 1964. Draft Regulations were published in the Federal Register on February 20th, 1965; draft testing procedures were issued in July of 1965. These are the procedures that our District Managers are now using in the field in testing and implementing the provisions of the Classification and Multiple Use Act.

Our implementation memorandum went out in October; the regulations were finally published in October of 1965 and test units, individual test units, were assigned to the field on October 11, 1965.

Regarding the test units which we selected, these involved 18 counties and 17 planning units. They are scattered all through the Western States. Every state in the West has at least one area; California has three areas which are under test.

In these 17 planning units, we selected--and by "we" these selections were made by the state BLM staff--we had 11 Type I areas, and we went up from there to Type II and IV areas.

Type I areas are essentially better block type public domain land, areas which are likely to remain in public ownership in the foreseeable future.

Type II areas are somewhat more scattered. Our good friends from Valley County will do some explaining shortly on this very subject.

Type IV are extremely scattered public type areas.

Alaska wasn't one of the test areas, but they are moving toward this.

Testing in these test areas that we have mentioned has been underway since October of 1965. Our first initial classification test packages have been submitted by two States, Montana and Arizona. These

are now being reviewed by the Director's Staff in Washington.

I would like to summarize briefly the packages that have been submitted by these two states, just to give you an idea of what they are doing. For example, both Montana and Arizona use Type I areas, better block of public domain areas. Montana used three units; Arizona, two units.

The name of the units are, in Montana, Sagehen, little Beaver and Rock Creek. In Arizona they used Units No. III and V.

The acreage of the public domain in Unit No. III in Montana is 614,700 acres. Just to give you an idea of the per centages, that's 50 per cent of the total land in the area, this acreage. In addition, there's 22 per cent additional that they call "Land Use Land."

This acreage here, 507,000, broken into the two units, amounts to 68 per cent of the total area, and this amounts to 72 per cent of the total area.

Now, a real important part of our classification procedures are what we call our "Public Participation Activities."

We wanted to get an idea of the number of meetings that our local District Managers and local offices held in informing the public and bringing to the public, the users, the interested parties, into their land use decisions, and Montana reported that they had some 25 to 30 meetings informing the local people of what was going on. Maurice Arnold and other people from Valley County will tell you much more about this.

Arizona reported some 30 to 50 statewide meetings. These were general, which included other Bureau programs, but explained the Classification Procedures.

As to the particular unit in Arizona, they had some 100 to 150 contacts relating to the classification action that they were about to take. Many of these were personal contacts. As far as I know they had actually one meeting.

This will be of interest to some of you, the degree of segregation which the states in these two situations proposed to take, and the degree of segregation will vary from area to area and situation to situation.

In Montana, there are only two types of segregation as provided for, or proposed to be provided. These are their agricultural filings, such as desert land and homestead, and sales, under the Public Sales Act. This is the old Public Sale Act, isolated rough and mountainous tracts.

This means that these lands are still open to such types of filings as state exchanges, private exchanges, the new Public Sale Act, recreation and public purpose, multiple claim occupancy--and there aren't many of these--state selections, color of title, script, and open to mining and mineral leasing.

In Arizona, they propose to segregate from several other things. In addition to agriculture and the public sale, small tracts, script, and state exchanges, and leaving the areas open to such things as private exchange, Public Land Sale Act, and so on.

I think that will about do it. If there are any other questions that I can help with, why, I would be glad to.

VALLEY COUNTY LEADS THE WAY
County-wide Planning

Remarks of Maurice Arnold, Chairman, Board of County Commissioners, Valley County, Montana, before the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 30, 1966.

It is indeed a privilege and a pleasure to appear before this fine group today and talk a little about county-wide planning.

I am here today to do my part as a public servant in the recommending of planning and uses of public lands to our National Advisory Board. To me, public lands means public air and water, the best in timber and grazing and wildlife and recreation.

In 1936, Valley County created their first cooperative grazing districts. In 1957, our State of Montana passed a city-county zoning law so we could zone within four and a half miles of an incorporated city. Valley County and the City of Glascow did that and immediately started their planning--and by the way, our city-county planning group has just about completed their study for the county and, of course, it takes care of most of our industrial area for the future.

The 1965 Montana Legislature passed a law so we, as counties, could plan countywide. We did start our little job of county planning, though, before we had that law. We read up on planning and discussed it and we thought we would start it as soon as possible. Now I will tell you how Valley County became a pilot county.

Whoever called us a nation of spectators was right: Boys watch girls; girls watch their weight, and everyone keeps a watchful eye on the government. Perhaps this is why the new land law suggests that the counties must first plan on zoning and then zone their lands in order to evaluate the proposed retention classification of public lands.

In August of 1964, I attended the National Convention of the National Association of County Officials in Washington, D. C. At that time I was invited up to Mr. Stoddard's office in the Department of the Interior to meet him and discuss planning. When I was in his office, he had three County Commissioners from the State of Oregon--I believe they were from Josephine County. These Commissioners were starting their planning, I think, at that time.

As a County Commissioner, I have read planning-zoning of heavily populated areas, cities, and counties. Many interesting articles were

found in NACO's monthly magazine and also in their Public Land Newsletter which Paul Carlin of NACO sends out. The monthly magazine is now referred to as "American Government," published once a month in Washington, D.C. Paul Carlin's newsletter on public lands is always interesting and has a lot of wonderful ideas for planning.

In the Spring of 1964, I received a phone call from Paul Carlin stating that they had been in touch with the Department of the Interior, the BLM, and that they had been discussing public lands in Montana with them. He thought of me as perhaps someone in our County who would care to tackle the job of county planning. I had known Paul for quite some time previously to this. He wanted to know if he could come to our State Convention which was to be held at Deerlodge, Montana, that year, in the middle of June. There would be some of the men from the Department of the Interior with him. I told him that Valley County would welcome the chance of becoming a pilot county.

So, during our convention, we met with them, and attending the meeting from Washington, D. C., was Paul Carlin of NACO, and Mr. Churchill, and one other gentleman from the Department--I forget what his name was. Mr. Linne who was the BLM State Director for Montana at that time, and Mr. Humphreys, who was the Malta District Manager, also attended that meeting, and we discussed planning and zoning.

They decided we should think it over and they would be back in the fall and talk planning with us again. By that time we would, perhaps, have made up our mind whether we wanted to become a pilot county in Montana.

In September they came to Glascow and we held this meeting. It was about the 14th of September. Those attending that meeting were Mr. Kendick and Mr. Martin of NACO from Washington, D. C., also Mr. Churchill and Mr. Chandler from Washington, D. C., from BLM, and members from the Association of County Commissioners Executive Committee. Also attending were our Public Land members and two professors from the University at Missoula. At this meeting we accepted and became the pilot county. Planning was discussed, and I believe that it was a good kickoff meeting.

We met different times at the Bureau of Land Management office in Malta, and they explained and discussed fire roads and land problems. At that time we were given permit blanks to fill out for any gravel found on BLM lands that could be used and tied down for use of county road gravel.

Maps were made of the public land in the area. This was quite necessary in order to start our planning.

Because of the severity of the winter of 1964 and 1965 our meetings were curtailed.

In the Spring of 1965, we Commissioners appointed the County Advisory Committee which is an 11-member board. They, in turn, elected Robert McColly as Chairman.

In selecting these eleven members, we picked them from throughout the County. We took some of the members from the grazing districts, some from the P.M.A. Committee throughout the county, and we selected about three of our most influential men in the City of Glascow.

In March of 1965, Mr. Humphreys and myself attended the Public Lands Management Congress held at Reno, Nevada. From this meeting we received a great deal of valuable information and planning.

As soon as we returned from the Reno meeting, we held a meeting in Glascow, advised our 11-member Advisory Council of the meeting and discussed it, and discussed planning. Then, we arranged for a big public meeting at the Civic Center in Glascow.

I believe that this perhaps covers it pretty well. I don't want to take up any more of your time and I will now let Mr. McColly tell you something about planning.

VALLEY COUNTY LEADS THE WAY
Public Participation in Land Use Planning

Remarks of Robert McColly, Chairman, Valley County Advisory Committee, before the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 30, 1966.

Mr. Chairman, Director Stoddard and Members of the National Advisory Board Council: It's a pleasure for me to be here today. I'm not going to unnecessarily take up your time because I know you have a long executive session to take care of this afternoon.

What I shall attempt to do this afternoon in my presentation is to summarize the procedures that we have gone through in our classification in Valley County, and to evaluate the success that we have had in this venture.

First, I would like to comment just for a moment on the State Cooperative Grazing Districts of Montana that Mr. Etchart and Mr. Arnold have both mentioned. Inasmuch as it is unique in the United States that no other state has this particular type of organization, I think that it warrants explanation.

The situation in Valley County as far as grazing lands were concerned, many years ago--and this goes back to just after the homestead days--was such that there were thousands upon thousands of horses as well as other types of livestock running at large in Valley County. Most of these horses--and they were a great problem at that time--were the result of the homesteaders. After they had left their homesteads and finally decided that they couldn't make a living on their 160 or 320 acres because of the type of land that we have in Montana, they packed their suitcase and took off. There wasn't enough room in that suitcase for their horses, so they left them because there was no sale for them.

These horses were left out on the open range--or what eventually became open range--because if the homesteaders had built any fences, they fell down, and this became open range.

These horses propagated to the extent that Valley County had to take steps to curb the numbers of horses in that area, and they had two county roundups to take care of the situation.

I don't know how many horses they gathered in these roundups, but I know that they gathered a considerable number and I believe--I was considerably younger in those days--that the procedure was to pay

the boys that were working on the roundup a dollar a head for each horse that they picked up and when they were going through it was a good idea to have your saddle horse and your work horses shut because I think a good number of the horses that were gathered had shoes on.

At any rate, the lands needed administering. There was no way to control the lands. The need got so great that the Montana State Legislature enacted laws that permitted the organization of State Cooperative Grazing Districts within the State of Montana. This is what we are referring to when we are talking about State Grazing Districts.

Over the years these State Grazing Districts administered the lands, and they were required to attempt to acquire all of the land within the boundaries of each District in order that there wouldn't be lands that would be isolated, lands that people wouldn't turn livestock out to and thereby infringe upon the rights of the other users within the State Grazing Districts. Over the years they have done a tremendous job in the administering of these lands.

Now, to get on with the thing that I got up here for. The maps up here show the lands that we were concerned with. This is Valley County. The map on the left side, or the center map as it is up here, is the land in Valley County, or, in other words, Valley County south of Milk River. The one nearest me is Valley County north of Milk River.

These lands in Valley County are typed in the four different kinds of lands. Mr. Chandler, in his presentation here a moment ago, pointed out three types of lands, but we have a unique type of land in Valley County which I will get into in just a moment.

The Type I lands are the best blocked lands of Federal ownership.

The criteria that was used in the designation of these types of lands was the ownership of the Federal land, the percentage of Federal ownership. In the Type I, which is the best blocked management areas, the criteria was that the ownership of Federal lands must be over 50 per cent, from 50 to 100 per cent of these lands must be Federal ownership.

In the Type II, which we classified as fragmented land management areas, the criteria was 30 to 50 per cent public lands, and in the Type IV lands, which were the transfer areas, the criteria was less than 30 per cent Federal lands.

These maps are small for this size room, so they are going to be hard to see, but I will point out these types of lands.

There are two units in Southern Valley County which are Type I lands. The Little Beaver is this part, this section of this area. The Sagehen planning unit is this section, between these lines, and in North Valley County we have one unit, the Rock Creek Planning unit which is this area between these lines here.

Well, I suppose I should explain the coloring on these maps now. The ownership patterns designated by color--the buff-colored areas are public domain. The areas that are pink in color are land utilization lands, the LU lands. They are lands which were repurchased by the United States under the Bankhead-Jones Act. These were submarginal lands, and it became an economic necessity for the owners of these lands to do something else. They weren't making a living on them, in other words, and this was a means of getting that suitcase to put their stuff in even though there wasn't enough room for their horses. These are the lands that are pink on this map.

The blue lands are the State of Montana lands and there are many of these lands in the Type II Grassland Fragmented Planning Unit. That is this area here.

You will notice that in this area, the blue lands are the school sections. These were the land grant lands which are Sections 16 and 36, as were pointed out a while ago.

The Type III land is something that hasn't been touched on before and these lands lie in Southern Valley County, and are all within the Charles M. Russell Game Range, a wildlife refuge.

There are also some other types of lands that are delineated red on this map in Southern Valley County, and they are encompassed in the C. M. Russell Wildlife Refuge. These are lands that belong to the Corps of Engineers. These are lands that were purchased for the Fort Peck Reservoir and they are owned by the Corps of Engineers, and we do have the Glasgow Air Force Base, which is a military reservation.

In the Type IV lands, this is what we refer to as the Milk River Pasture Planning Unit, and this lies on both sides of Milk River in this area, north in this area and adjacent to, and above and below Milk River.

217-692 O-66—13

The relative ownership, the percentage of ownership by the United States in these particular areas in the Rock Creek Planning Unit, the area north of Milk River on the nearest map to me, is 342,600 acres of United States land. This includes both the feeding and the LU. This is 68 per cent of the total land area within those boundaries.

In the Sagehen Planning Unit, the total acreage is 238,800, and this is 81 per cent of the total area.

And, in the Little Beaver area, there is 310,700 acres, and this is 70 per cent of the total land area.

As we considered the possible ways of classifying these lands, there were many lines of thought. At first, we thought that perhaps in the--well, I guess I didn't tell you about the ownership in the Type IV Transfer area.

This is a little bit less than 10 per cent and in the Type II Grassland and Farming area, which is this area here, the ownership in the United States is 30 per cent plus, somewhere a little over 30 per cent.

As we considered the possible ways of classifying these lands, our first thought was that perhaps the transfer areas, the isolated tracts of land in the Type IV area should, perhaps, go out of the Federal ownership because they are lands that are hard to manage; they're hard to administer inasmuch as they are isolated tracts and small tracts of land. This was never decided upon, of course, but this was what we sort of had in our minds, and that was the way that we were going to approach the thing.

Then, we began to think about ways of getting the assistance of the residents of Valley County, the public, shall we say. We decided that perhaps the best way to do this would be to have meetings with the civic groups or the organizations that were the most active in their particular areas, and this is the way that we approached the problem.

But, lo and behold, when we started to have these meetings, the suggestions that we got were not for the best blocked areas, nor were they for the fragmented areas; the suggestions that we got were for the fragmented areas. The people would point out to us the particular sites that should perhaps be reserved for the ownership of the United States for picnic sites; for camping sites; for fishing areas, this type of thing.

So, we changed our line of thought about classification and thought we should work, in the beginning--although we didn't forget the other types of plans, we were working on all of them at the same time--but, so far as classification was concerned, we began working on the block classified type of land. It seemed reasonable that these lands should remain in the ownership of the United States, so this is the way that we have proceeded.

We attempted to reach every possible type of user of these lands. In Valley County, the main industry is agriculture, the entire economy is agriculture with the exception of Fort Peck Dam which has some electrical generation, the Glasgow Air Force Base, which contributes to the economy of Valley County, and a few other things; but basically, the economy of Valley County is agricultural in nature and these lands are all grassland. So the return to the United States dollarwise is contributed by the livestock owner and operator in the form of grazing fees. We considered them real seriously.

The other type of use that these lands are subjected to is the sportsmen, the hunter. There is some camping in the area, but so far as recreation is concerned, this is a thing that we must consider in the future because more and more people will come into our area. More area is going to be needed for recreational purposes, but generally speaking, the use that the lands are subjected to right now is grazing and hunting, wildlife.

We have approached both of these groups. We have called in everyone that we could possibly think of that could possibly use them. We have talked to miners--there is some mineral activity in Valley County, although it is relatively minor. And at the State Advisory Board Meeting which was held in Glasgow this year, we got the proposals that we have out to the mining interests by way of the mining interest members of the State Advisory Board.

We can see where we have probably made some errors in our approaches, although I don't feel that we have made too many. Generally speaking, we have done our job quite well.

As was already mentioned by Mr. Chandler, we had a lot of meetings. As we were working in the Committee this morning, I pointed out that through these meetings we got the word out to all of the interested people in Valley County, and in many cases people who weren't interested at all. In some cases they were sort of captive audiences.

The proposal that we made was the retention of the Type I lands because they were the types of lands that looked like they should be

in the ownership of the United States. It looked like this would probably be the best use, the best return to the United States and to us, and this is the way we evaluated them. We are sure that if these lands were put up for sale, it would be mighty hard on the livestock operators and, as a result, on the economy of Valley County in general because even though the livestock operator--and we are talking about the public domain lands now because under the terms of the Bankhead-Jones Act, the LU lands cannot be resold. They can be traded for equal value, but so far as actual sales are concerned, they must remain in the actual ownership of the United States until the Bankhead-Jones Act is amended. It looked like these were the type of lands that should remain in the ownership of the United States.

We are still working on the other types, and we will approach these in their proper order. We feel that the next type of land that we will work on will be the transfer areas.

As we held these meetings, we attempted to get the civic groups to work on getting these proposals out and getting opinions of the people, because specific interest groups are the ones that know their problems the best, they are the ones that can point out the specific needs of their particular groups. For instance, who is a rancher to say, what the recreationist wants in the nature of camp facilities or in the line of areas that should be reserved for his particular use. Who is the recreationist to say what land should be reserved for hunting areas. Nor, are they capable of saying what types of land should be reserved for grazing.

So, we were laboring under the presumption that the members of specific interest groups were the ones that were most capable of pointing out specific needs to us, and I think that we were on the right track in this work.

The meetings that we held were at various stages of success. Some of the meetings that we thought would perhaps be the best attended fell flat on their face. Why? We don't really know. One of the most outstanding failures was in our presentation to the wildlife groups, the last of January or the first of February this year.

I thought we had ample publicity on this but most of the wildlife people, the people that are interested in the wildlife so far as the public is concerned, were people that in making a meeting--this was a daytime meeting and perhaps we should have had an evening meeting in order that it would have been at a better time for them to attend. It's an off-season so far as hunting is concerned

and we all know that the most interest in wildlife is just before or during the hunting season, so perhaps the timing was wrong on it and that was the reason why it failed. It was our most outstanding failure at any rate.

One of our most successful meetings was among the livestock people. This was a natural thing because their very economy depends upon the use of these public lands. They are very highly interested in how these lands are classified and how they are ultimately retained or disposed of because their very livelihood depends upon them in many cases.

We have had many meetings; I haven't attended one meeting where I haven't forgotten something and I am going to this time, that's for sure. This is the reason we have question and answer periods, so that somebody can get out the points that we forget to make.

Anyway, we came up with a--I have already said this--we came up with a proposal for the retention of the Type I lands and we asked each group that we met with if there was any particular opposition to this particular proposal, if they felt that we were in error in our proposal. We had no opposition whatsoever so far as our area and district community meetings were concerned.

When it finally came to a public meeting, a public hearing, we did have some opposition, but we felt as we evaluated the opposition, that it was probably apprehension so far as the administration of the land was concerned. In most of the objections, it was not on the type of land, the Type I lands that we were concerned with right at that particular time, but upon the Type II lands. This is the intermixed ownership lands, so this is something that we are going to have to work out in the future.

We have come to the point now where we are getting the public support. Without the support of the public we never possibly could have gotten this job done nearly as well or as successfully as we have done up to this point. And I don't mean to imply that our job is done; I think our job has just started.

I have covered most of the points that I can think of right off of the top of my head anyway. If there are any questions on this now, please feel free to ask us about them because we surely will attempt to answer them for you.

PLANNING IN A PROTOTYPE COUNTY
Questions and Answers

Discussion among Council members and guest participants at the National Advisory Board Council, Riverside, California, March 30, 1966.

MR. ETCHART: Before I open this up to questions, I want to back up to what Eldon said in regard to the work that the district Bureau people did. As a person who was an observer on the scene, I can tell you that Bob McColly and Maurice Arnold and all of the District BLM people did a lot of work. As I look at these various maps of these other states and multiply this work over the United States, I can tell you that BLM has a tremendous job before them. I certainly was impressed by the efforts made at Malta in carrying out this pilot project.

With that, I think we have a few minutes, maybe not too very many, but surely there are some questions. Would somebody like to lead off and ask these gentlemen something that has come to mind?

MR. SWALLOW: What sources were used for individuals or land consultants to get the details, or was that mostly gotten from the BLM? In other words, who was used on the technical end of the gathering of the information, preparing the maps, and that sort of thing?

MR. MC COLLY: The Bureau of Land Management District personnel in the Malta office did all of the technical work. They prepared the maps, and without them we couldn't possibly have gotten the job done. We didn't have the facilities, for instance, to work up these maps, and we are very grateful to the Malta District personnel for doing this.

MR. GERBER: You mentioned that in your class IV classification, if I remember, there were some problems that you did not anticipate, that is, on this scattered tract. Have you changed your classification, or is that still in Class IV? Are you going to put that back in Class I as a block to be retained, or how are you going to handle that?

MR. MC COLLY: This is still Class IV land because the Class IV lands, the criteria that is used there is the percentage of Federal ownership.

What we will do on these types of lands, instead of just saying as we originally thought we would, "Well, these lands will be transferred out of the ownership of the United States," we will evaluate each tract of land in these Type IV lands in order to determine what uses they can best be put to; whether this individual 40 acres is best transferred from the ownership of the United States to private ownership or whether it should be retained for a recreation site, a camp site, or something of this nature. In other words, each tract will be determined upon its own merits so far as its disposal or retention is concerned.

MR. DOYAL STILES: You referred to wildlife, about participation. Did you refer to the sportsmen or the fish and game personnel back there?

MR. MC COLLY: We specifically invited people from the Montana Fish and Game to participate and we anticipated attendance from all sportsmen's groups, whether it be an individual hunter or whether representing a specific sportsmen's group, but I think I pointed out pretty well the reasons that we fell on our face. Our timing was wrong, for one thing; perhaps, we didn't give it the publicity that we should have. At any rate, we didn't do too well on this particular phase.

MR. STILES: I have another question. What I mean is, isolated tracts. Do you have any lands or are these for public ownership or access areas and habitat areas? Do you have any discussion on that?

MR. MC COLLY: We haven't worked on them extensively up to this time. We have had no recommendations in this respect, if this is what you are referring to.

So far as wildlife habitat is concerned, this is grass country. This is not mountainous country. This is strictly grass country, generally speaking. There are some draws and gulleys that have some brush and some small trees in them, but generally speaking, it's grass country. Our wildlife consists of upland game birds, sage grouse, sharp tailed grouse, Chinese Pheasants, and Hungarian Pheasants.

We have considerable numbers of white tail and black tail muledeer as well as quite a number of antelope. The habitat for wildlife is the same as it is for livestock grazing; it's the entire area.

MR. BRIANT H. STRINGHAM, Utah: What are you ultimately shooting at? So far as classification is concerned, what is your ultimate aim?

MR. MC COLLY: Our ultimate aim is to classify the lands as to serve the very best purpose of the people of the United States in the interest of the United States, because we feel that the very thing that precludes any possible single use of these lands is what is commonly referred to as the "population explosion of the United States." Even though we are a sparsely settled area as compared to areas such as we went through yesterday, we can foresee in the future that we are going to get some impact. We are going to get some influx of population, some demand for the use of those lands from metropolitan areas such as the Twin Cities.

This is what we are working for, looking to the future to forestall any possibility of errors in management and classification and zoning such as we encountered here yesterday.

MR. STRINGHAM: Is this donation work or who is paying the bill?

MR. MC COLLY: Valley County has some levy to take care of planning in Valley County. So far as the Bureau of Land Management personnel are concerned, they are being paid by the United States Government because they are already employed by the Bureau of Land Management. This is where we get our technical assistance. Practically all of the assistance that we have had, all of the work that has been done has been voluntary work.

MR. ARNOLD: I would like to explain on that farther.

Mr. McColly and I went around nights and held these meetings. We held them at night because people were busy in the daytime and wouldn't be able to attend them. That's why we had such good turnouts and why we have gotten so many good opinions. We did it at night and we drove as high as 150 to 200 miles to attend a meeting.

We set up $500 in our Planning Fund. We told Robert McColly to sit down and figure out his mileage. In Montana you can usually charge eight cents a mile and any expenses that have been incurred, and to date, he hasn't figured out his claim yet. We aren't worried about the amount because whatever he puts in, we know it will be right. So far, that is really all the money that we have spent on our planning.

MR. ETCHART: Someone asked a question about the planning of the game habitat. I don't think that there has been any particular planning by this group, any more than the normal planning, shall we say, of the Bureau. I would like to make the observation, and I am doing it before an expert, that I think the game habitat is excellent. We have a lot of game and a lot of hunting opportunity. I think that Eldon Smith probably would agree with that.

MR. SMITH: Gene hauled me around about two weeks ago in an airplane to make sure that I saw the game and the habitat. I can't hardly say anything else, but I would like to make one comment in regard to Bob's statement about the lack of participation on the part of the wildlife people, and I presume lack of participation on the part of the professional people as well.

That has been noted and that has been taken care of in Montana. The rest of the counties in Montana can anticipate complete participation by both the labor groups and the professional groups at each and every county operation.

I would like to also state that, as far as the wildlife people are concerned, it is part of their responsibility, to keep their contact with both the BLM and the Fish and Game Department and various groups to make sure that they are there "Johnny on the spot."

I would regret to hear any other individual of any other state or any other county have to make a statement about the wildlife people that Mr. McColly just made, in all honesty.

MR. ARNOLD: I would like to say a word here.

This map here doesn't show all of Valley County, and I would like to explain this to you.

This here stacks on top of that. You see, this is Milk River here and this is Saskatchewan, Canada up here. Now, that's stacked on top and then there's this much of Valley County on the east side. It doesn't show the Fort Peck Reservoir and it doesn't show Glasgow, I don't believe, or--only about half of the South Willow Creek country and so forth. I just thought I would bring that out, that this map does not show the whole area of Valley County.

MR. MC COLLY: I would like to say just one word, if I could, and I wasn't pointing a finger at you, Eldon. I still feel that it was basically our fault that we didn't have the wildlife participation that we should have had, because I don't think that we gave it the proper publicity.

MR. SMITH: Thanks, Bob. I don't agree with you. I think you should be pointing the finger at us.

MR. MC COLLY: The setting is proper here and I keep looking around and I am sure that St. Peter must be around here someplace because a person should never have glowing, nice things said about him until after he is dead because things like this will inflate his ego and he won't be worth a damn from here on.

Thank you, it's been a pleasure being with you.

MR. ETCHART: Thank you, gentlemen, for participating in this discussion and with that, that will conclude this portion of the program.

Summary of advisory actions adopted by the National Advisory Board Council in 26th Annual Session at Riverside, California, on March 30, 1966, and recommended to the Secretary of the Interior for his consideration.

A. Industry Use Committee:

1. In order to insure, to the greatest possible extent, the soundness of land classification actions under the Classification and Multiple Use Act, and in order to enable the Bureau of Land Management to pursue a vigorous, orderly, and expeditious program for the classification of tracts for retention for multiple use management or for selective responsible disposal:

a. That the (Bureau's) State multiple use advisory boards establish mechanisms for continuing consideration of land classification requirements in terms of objectives and priorities and for the assistance of district advisory boards with respect to land classification matters; and

b. That the Bureau's district managers encourage the formation of local land use planning committees within their districts to work with the district managers and the advisory boards on a continuing basis on land use planning and land classification matters.

2. That all users of the public lands should use all due precaution to avoid unnecessary damage to the public lands and should make reasonable effort to correct damages caused by their activities. In this connection, the Council commends the oil and gas industry for its constructive response to the need for regulations governing prospecting for leasable minerals on the public lands. The Council urges members of the mining industry to take the initiative in formulating rules for prospecting and location operations on the public lands.

3. That the cochairmen of the Council, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, select a committee to work with and advise the Bureau of Land Management in its effort to arrive at a fair and equitable grazing fee; this committee to make a report to the full Council at the fall meeting.

4. That proposed changes of the wording in the regulations, 43 CFR 4111.1, to accommodate associations, and 43 CFR 4115.2-1(k), concerning ten-day delay, be adopted.

B. Resource Management Committee:

1. That caution be exercised to judge adequate communication with the public and yet avoid over-meeting on land classification.

2. That the Bureau of Land Management clarify to all district advisory boards the questions on contributions to range improvements raised by Instruction Memo No. 66-51.

3. That improved considerations be given to competition between big-game and livestock on an area by area basis rather than under broad brush, blanket allowances of grazing capacity.

4. That local land use planning and zoning to the greatest extent are endorsed.

5. That local meetings and public participation in land use planning, as undertaken by the Bureau of Land Management under the Classification and Multiple Use Act, are endorsed.

C. Public Use Committee:

1. That each State Director, Bureau of Land Management, be requested to study the use of off-highway vehicles in their several States and furnish the Bureau Director the results of such study thirty days prior to the next meeting of the Council.

2. That a plan of exchange for use be developed which would facilitate and improve access to public lands where problems of access exist.

D. Community and Intergovernmental Affairs Committee:

1. That the Bureau of Land Management expand its program of education to enhance public understanding of the new era of public land management and disposition.

2. That the program of intergovernmental relations which involves the marriage between Bureau of Land Management responsibility under the Classification and Multiple Use Act and the responsibility for zoning and land use planning at the local level be expanded with vigor.

3. That there be a series of state-wide conferences, co-sponsored by the Bureau of Land Management, toward expanding and bringing further support to the very important program of land classification underway.

4. That there be pursued further supplemental agreements between the Bureau of Land Management and soil conservation districts to carry out various watershed and land treatment programs, after land has been classified in accordance with the multiple use concept.

5. That the Bureau of Land Management strengthen contacts with city and state agencies.

6. That Bureau of Land Management exploit to the fullest its opportunities of having county officials participate in state-wide meetings.

7. That it be recognized that one of the new dimensions of land management and retention has to be a scientific program of the investment of public funds so that the public interest can be served.

E. Public Information and Education Committee:

1. That the Bureau of Land Management conduct an aggressive in-service training program to improve the public relations abilities of all key field personnel for better explaining the program of multiple use management.

2. That the Secretary be complimented for the progress of the Bureau of Land Management in its efforts to date toward implementing previous recommendations of the Committee made through the Council last year.

F. Council in Full Session:

1. That a committee be established within the Council to consider and prepare recommendations toward the development of a national policy which would define what lands under what situations should be put into preservation or single-use status.

2. That consideration be given to designating Judge Dan H. Hughes of Colorado as Chairman Emeritus of the National Advisory Board Council henceforth, in recognition of his long and very generous and very beneficial public service, not only as a member and chairman of the Council but in many other ways.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1966 O—217-692

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225